DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 543 RC 015 254

AUTHOR	Hutinger, Patricia, Ed.; Smith-Dickson, Bonnie, Ed.
TITLE	Making It Work in Rural Communities. Proceedings of the Annual HCEEP Rural Workshop (2nd, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, June 10-12, 1981).
INSTITUTION	Western Illinois Univ., Macomb. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC. Handicapped Children's Early Education Program.
PUB DATE	Mar 82
GRANT	G00810087
NOTE	91p.; For related documents, see ED 211 302 and RC 015 255. The Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP) Rural Network is an association of professionals representing education programs for young handicapped children in rural communities.
AVAILABLE FROM	Rural Network, College of Education, Room 27, Horrabin Hall, Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL 61455 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Problems; Agency Cooperation; Community Information Services; Delivery Systems; *Educational Change; Educational Policy; Financial Support; Inservice Education; *Lobbying; Parent Participation; Politics of Education; Program Descriptions; *Program Improvement; Public Policy; Questionnaires; Recruitment; Referral; *Rural Areas; Rural Population; Social Networks; Summative Evaluation; Transitional Programs; Transportation; *Young Children
IDENTIFIERS	*Early Intervention; Handicapped Childrens Early Education Program; *Networking

ABSTRACT

Texts of two keynote addresses, synopses of workshop proceedings, and a detailed conference evaluation comprise this report of a conference planned to foster information exchange and collaboration--networking--among rural early intervention professionals. The address by Barbara Zang discusses specific skills and techniques for influencing state and federal policy and emphasizes the need for service providers to understand and be involved in the legislative process. The address by Everett D. Edington considers the process of change in rural schools and communities and cites characteristics of rural schools which affect willingness to change, e.g., their multiple functions, their limited and precarious economic base, and rural fears of federal colonialism. Synopses of 13 workshop topics, amounting to nearly half the report, cover transition from early childhood handicapped programs to public schools, interagency coordination, lobbying, service delivery strategies, inservice training, fund raising, staff recruitment and retention, parent involvement, transportation, and the development of rural networks for early intervention programs. The conference evaluation report includes ratings of each event for quality and usefulness and sample responses to 10 open-ended questions concerning strengths and weaknesses of the conference. Appendices contain a directory of participants and the 5-page conference evaluation questionnaire. (JHZ)

ED256543

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RC015254

About the Rural Network Monographs

The State of the Art Task Force has as its responsibility the collection and distribution of information related to effective strategies for delivering services to rural young handicapped children and their families. During 1980-1981, a series of monographs was undertaken by contributors across the country under the editorial direction of Patricia Hutinger. During 1981-82, a second series of monographs is underway, again under the editorial direction of Hutinger. Contents of the two series of monographs (see back cover) reflect the most pressing needs of rural HCEEP projects. Other topics are under consideration by members of the Rural Network and will be forthcoming.

This document presents the proceedings of the Second HCEEP Rural Workshop and reflects the attitudes, philosophies and commitments to delivering services to young handicapped children and their families in rural areas.

This document was developed pursuant to grant GOO810087 from the U.S. Department of Education. Those who undertake such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgement in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Department of Education position or policy.

OSE Project Office, Sandra Hazen

March 1982
The Rural Network

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MAKING IT WORK IN RURAL COMMUNITIES

Proceedings of the Second HCEEP Rural Workshop

Edited by
Patricia L. Hutinger
Bonnie J. Smith-Dickson

Sheraton Century Center
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
June 10-12, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	iii
Introduction	1
Keynote Address	2
Affecting State and Federal Policy ... Barbara Zang	
Keynote Address	12
Effective Change in Rural Schools and Communities ... Everett Edington	
Synopsis of HCEEP Rural Workshop	18
Topical Sessions	
HCEEP Rural Workshop Evaluation	60
Appendices	70

PREFACE

TO PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECOND (HCEEP) HANDICAPPED CHILDREN'S EARLY EDUCATION PROGRAM RURAL WORKSHOP

The Second Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP) Rural Workshop firmly established the HCEEP Rural Network as a visible, meaningful force working for the education of young handicapped children and their families in rural areas. The workshop, with participants from 48 rural early intervention projects located in 35 states, provided an important forum for communication among rural early intervention professionals. Further, the workshop led to significant new initiatives for the Rural Network. The significance of the workshop can be clarified by briefly tracing the background of the HCEEP Rural Network.

The HCEEP Rural Network, first titled the HCEEP Rural Consortium, emerged during the 1978 HCEEP Projects Conference in Washington, D.C. At that time approximately 20 persons representing rural projects within the HCEEP organization joined to form a rural network. The network intended to provide a voice for America's rural young handicapped children and their families and to increase educational opportunities for this population. Participating projects also expressed a desire to enhance their own effectiveness in providing educational and supportive services to their clients; therefore, it was decided that rural projects needed to share information about problems they encountered and about effective solutions they ascertained.

In March, 1980, the Rural Network held its first national workshop in Nashville, Tennessee. A highly successful event, the first workshop created cohesion and direction for the Network, as well as providing abundant technical information for participants.

Following the 1980 workshop, the Network moved forward vigorously with several important accomplishments. The organizational structure of the Network was crystallized at the 1980 HCEEP Projects Conference. A monograph series, edited by Patricia Hutinger, was initiated. To date, nine publications have been issued, including one describing the proceedings of the first Rural Workshop. The Network has continued to be attentive to public policy issues concerning the young handicapped child in rural regions. Finally, the Network planned and conducted the Second Rural Workshop.

Building upon previous accomplishments, the Second Rural Workshop also proved to be effective. It established important communication links among projects serving young handicapped children in rural areas across the nation. Participants were exposed to models of rural service delivery and to salient issues relevant to providing services to rural children. Perhaps the most interesting outcome, at a time when the federal role in education appears to be decreasing, was the move towards building regional networks for underserved rural areas of the nation. Initial steps towards organizing regional networks were taken at the workshop. Leaders were identified and plans for future elaboration of the regional networks were formulated. The Rural Network emerged from the Second Rural Workshop strengthened, directed and reenergized.

On behalf of the entire Rural Network, I wish to thank the workshop planning committee and, especially, its chairperson, Corinne Garland, HCEEP Rural Network Coordinator. Her systematic attention to planning and operating the workshop was largely responsible for its success. Other members of the planning committee were Tal Black, Harris Gabel, David Gilderman, Patti Hutinger, Sharon Kiefer, Mary Morse, and Jamie Tucker. Workshop participants enjoyed the benefits of the local arrangements coordinated by Laura Champ and Joanne Gordoni. The excitement and direction of the workshop were also due to the excellent presenters, whose contributions we appreciate. Still, it was the participants themselves who enabled the workshop to accomplish its successes, and we acknowledge their efforts with gratitude. Finally, I wish to acknowledge the essential support given to the Rural Network by the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program, Office of Special Education, U.S. Department of Education.

Harris Gabel, Chairman
HCEEP RURAL NETWORK

INTRODUCTION

In 1978, a small group of professionals serving young handicapped children in rural areas began meeting to talk about problems they had encountered in trying to provide rural programs. The premise upon which that first meeting and all subsequent activities of the HCEEP Rural Network has rested is that we have a great deal to learn from one another. Among the educators, social workers, public health nurses, mental health clinicians and others who work in rural communities with young handicapped children and their families, there is not only an awareness of the enormous hurdles we face in delivering necessary services, there is also a tremendous body of knowledge, a storehouse of skills, a wealth of ingenuity and creativity which have been applied to the solving of rural problems.

The Second National Rural Workshop sponsored by the HCEEP Rural Network was planned to create new opportunities for the sharing of existing information. However, the workshop planners wished to go beyond the traditional conference format in which a few experts present information to a large group. Recognizing each workshop participant as a valuable resource with much to contribute, the workshop planning committee attempted to create, within the two day workshop, an atmosphere which would encourage discussion and collaboration in an effort to improve the quality of services to young handicapped children. To a large extent, we were successful. Evaluation comments of participants focused on the informal atmosphere, the openness of participants, and the opportunity for communication.

In a troubled financial climate we can ill afford to waste valuable time, energy, and resources on solving problems or developing new programs without drawing on the wisdom of those who have dealt with similar problems. While an annual workshop provides an ideal opportunity for making contact with people who have the needed information or for hammering out a new approach with a small group now experiencing similar difficulties, this process should be a continuous one. An annual workshop should be the beginning, a time for establishing the lines of communication, which are open year round, for rural service providers to use as they face the daily problems of building and strengthening services for young handicapped children.

The dictionary defines "network" as a "fabric or structure of threads, cords, wires crossing each other at certain intervals and knotted or secured at the crossing." The Rural Workshops have been the crossing points. The Second Rural Workshop had built into its agenda opportunities for the development of regional networks to assist participants in identifying potential resources and partners in problem solving who were closer to home. The beginning of the regional networks has offered us an opportunity to strengthen our network by adding new wires, and by increasing the intersections, the points at which our mutually supportive relationships can be secured and fastened. To this extent, the Second Rural Workshop itself and the regional networking efforts which emerged in Oklahoma City have been unequivocally successful.

We look forward to strengthening our relationship with you from whom we have so much to learn.

Corinne Garland, Coordinator
HCEEP Rural Network

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

AFFECTING STATE AND FEDERAL POLICY

BARBARA ZANG

Editor's Note: Ms. Zang's address is presented here as delivered at the workshop.

Affecting State and Federal Policy

Barbara Zang
State Network Organizer
Children's Defense Fund
1520 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Presented to:
Second HCEEP Rural Workshop
Sheraton Century Center Hotel
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
June 10-12, 1981

These are indeed challenging times. At the federal level, children's programs which have solid track records, which have been fine-tuned and carefully honed over the past ten or more years are being cut-back, dismantled, block granted and, in some cases, eliminated. At the state level hold-the-line budgets or cutback in basic services are the norm. Children's programs, which have never been fully funded or equipped to meet the needs of all children who require help, are being wiped out as if we have no collective responsibility for their health care or education or general well-being.

These are times when members of Congress who defend proven public programs, such as child nutrition, get targeted for extinction by right wing conservative PAC's. These are times of electronic mail and computerized mailing lists. The air, and the airwaves, are full of "pro-family" rhetoric, while programs which have supported families are being dismantled.

Given the anti-government, fiscally conservative flavor of the political arena today and given that the programs we want for children are, and will for the most part be, publicly financed and administered, we have our work cut out for us.

These are formidable times for those who work on behalf of children. Our constituents, children, do not vote and do not join political parties. They do not have money and do not, therefore, contribute to campaigns or to political action committees. They are politically invisible. Your constituency alone numbers around 500,000. That is the number of children under age six who are handicapped. I commend you for your willingness to get involved in state and federal policy work now. And I welcome you to this work. I am delighted to have this opportunity to share some techniques for working at both levels of policy development. But before I get into specifics, I would like to take a minute or two to tell you about the Children's Defense Fund (CDF).

CDF is a national public charity which seeks to provide an informed voice for children in the policy process.

We use a variety of strategies to seek changes for children; research, public education, litigation and legislative work have been our tools for over 10 years. We have worked in the areas of education, particularly in education for handicapped and disadvantaged children, child health, child welfare, child care and child development, including Head Start.

Our work in special education is a good example of our multi-strategy approach. We used litigation on behalf of a statewide class of Mississippi

children who were being denied appropriate education. We won Mattie T. v Holliday and our Mississippi staff continues to oversee the progress towards getting those children into appropriate educational settings. I should add that Mississippi is the only state in which we have a branch office.

94-142 and 504: Numbers that Add Up to Educational Rights for Handicapped Children is a long title for a small handbook we published several years ago. This piece has been widely used by parent groups, state agencies, and independent organizations working on behalf of handicapped children. Perhaps you have seen it. To date, it is our best seller.

We have continued our public education effort by publishing information about the status of special education in the Congress in CDF Reports, our monthly newsletter. Since we began the newsletter 15 months ago, we have also featured the work of several local groups advocating on behalf of handicapped children.

Over a year ago, CDF helped form the Education Advocates Coalition, a group of nearly two dozen state and national organizations, which examined the (then) Bureau of Education for the Handicapped's administration of 94-142. Our findings prompted the Department of Education to do its own study of 94-142 operations which disclosed many of the same problems the advocates had identified. The Department was on its way to improving conditions; recent staff changes have slowed this down considerably. The Advocates continue to work for change in their respective states, however, and we facilitate communication between the members.

Currently we are working at the legislative level to try to pull the special education and Title I programs from the proposed block grants. These categorical programs have worked well for poor and handicapped children. In just a few short years we have seen some tremendous gains in the education of handicapped children. The block grants would repeal the helpful provisions of 94-142, the IEP requirements, the entitlement provisions, due process rights and protections. We believe good policy dictates sticking with a program that is working--to keep these public education dollars targeted on poor and handicapped children through categorical programs.

I have pulled together the key elements for state and federal policy work using our own methods and techniques, along with others used successfully by groups with which we work.

Learn the legislative process.

For most of us, the legislative process is something we last studied in 9th grade civics. If you are going to work at the state level, it is critical to know what is going on--and when. If you are going to try to pass legislation, when should you start to work on it? Who will write the bill? What happens after that? What committiees are responsible for what programmatic area? Is there a cut-off date for introduction of new bills? Does the legislature take up new bills every session? In Kentucky, the legislature meets every other year. You have to know the basics so you can adequately plan your strategy. That goes for working for or against other pieces of legislation as well as on something your group wants to get introduced.

In addition to learning the process for creating new legislation, it is also important to know the financial side of things.

What is your state's budget process? What is the timetable for budget action? Is it important to have funds for your program show up in the Governor's budget? If so, what is the process and timetable for getting your request considered by the Administration?

What is the committee structure? Do any of your representatives sit on key authorizing or financing committees? If so, that is an asset for you will have good access to that person as a constituent.

As a practical matter, I would suggest you purchase a loose leaf notebook for this basic information. Keep the information in one place, update it as necessary. Phone numbers and home addresses of key elected officials are important to have on hand. Office numbers, too, if they are available.

How do you gain this legislative knowledge? There are several ways. The League of Women Voters in some states has been especially diligent about developing materials on the state legislative process. Also, organizations which monitor the process, Common Cause, church and labor groups, for example, also would be able to tell you how the legislature operates. You might consider inviting a legislator to one of your meetings to explain the process to your group.

At the national level, we have developed some tools for people like you. Our booklet Children and the Federal Budget is fairly new and already popular with advocates. It describes the Congressional budget process and lays out the timetable for action. The Congressional budget process itself is quite new and quite complex. Until the mid-1970's, Congress merely acted on the President's budget proposals. Now it has its own research arm--the Congressional Budget Office--and a process which has become this year the vehicle for making massive budgetary changes.

Develop an action agenda.

In each legislative session--whether it be at the state or federal level--many issues of interest to children's advocates will surface, I do not think it is possible to work on everything and be successful in anything. In other words, pick your issues. It may be that there is legislation you have developed and want to see passed. Or a bill that will extend or improve existing programs that you will want to work to support. Or devastating proposals you will want to work on to kill off. Make some choices. I believe it is better to win on one or two things you know you can achieve rather than to cover the waterfront and try to do a little something on everything. There will be a great temptation to tackle everything. Please do not.

At CDF, we have several long range goals we seek to achieve for children. In each area we annually examine how far we have come towards meeting the goal. We assess the political climate and develop our short range goals for the coming year. These short range goals form our action agenda.

I suggest you make a decision about what you want to accomplish. Decide how much research you will have to do, get your facts straight, and come up

with a timetable for implementing your strategy. Once you have done the basic homework, you will be in a better position to attract supporters; you will be able to clearly articulate what you are trying to accomplish and why.

An example of recent state legislative activity around an issue which will, I think, interest you, happened in Kansas. Knowing that the legislative session was drawing to a close, Kansas Advocates for Special Education wanted to raise the issue of pre-school education for handicapped children in hopes of raising awareness and getting a jump on the next legislative session.

Kansas Advocates is a statewide group of parents of handicapped children. It is two years old and has operated from its beginnings from someone's kitchen table, with no paid staff.

The public hearings that were held on this issue attracted parents from all over the state. The one day hearing was extended another day to accommodate the many people who wanted to testify. These hearings were an eye-opener for the legislators. They will take up the issue during the next session--which is what KASE hoped for. I believe this is a good example of a group which did its homework, mastered the legislative process, and mobilized its network of supporters in a timely way to achieve what it set out to do. They are working now to develop language for the legislation.

Cultivate allies and supporters.

Once you know the legislative process and you know what you want to accomplish, begin to figure out which groups will be for you, which against. Look around for supporters. Here are some possibilities:

1) Parents of children in your program
2) Staff of your program
3) Head Start, special education and other teachers
4) Early childhood educators
5) Professionals such as speech therapists, psychologists and others who may have organizations which will get behind the issue
6) Church and civic groups
7) Women's groups
8) Special interest groups who work on behalf of the handicapped.

Before you actually seek the support of these groups, ask yourself what each could gain from supporting your efforts. Why should they support the issue? This brief analysis will come in handy when you approach the group for support. You will have thought through the "what is in it for me" question and will have a response.

There is a pitfall you must avoid in the ally seeking stage and that is the urge to form an unfocused coalition. Too many advocates form the coalition first, then try to decide together what to work on. Pick your issue, develop it, then seek support. You may have to modify your position a bit depending on who you attract, but your goals and the research to uphold them ought to be able to keep the support focused.

Educate the public about your issue.

Children's advocates have much to learn about public education. Our issues are seen as complex, as difficult to understand, and often they are. While children themselves can attract public sentiment, their problems, in education or child welfare or other areas, often leave the public cold. The jargon and technical language we use have been a rather effective shield against public support for our issues. We have got to change this situation. Clearly articulate the situation you are trying to change. Who is affected? What is the problem? Why is it happening? What do you want to change? How?

Once you have the basic message down, develop a plan for getting it to the public--and by public I mean the general public and public servants. Perhaps someone in your group will accept the responsibility for conducting the public education piece for your issue.

Identify the media outlets in the area you are covering whether it be your city, congressional district or the state. Keep a notebook of essential information. Include the names, addresses, phone numbers, names of editors, deadlines for daily and weekly papers.

Identify the radio stations in the area, the public affairs director of the station, the names and air times of talk shows.

If there is TV coverage in your area, go through the same process. Identify the stations, the talk show opportunities, the public affairs shows and the names of public affairs producers. Add this information to your media notebook for handy reference.

Finally, include newsletters of other groups with interests similar to yours. When are their deadlines? How frequently do they publish? Who is the editor? Where do you send a copy?

Develop personal contact with editors and public affairs directors. It will pay off in the long run if you can call on these people from a friendly rather than an unknown position.

Here are some ideas for a public education campaign around your issue. Get a feature story about the problem situation into the major paper or papers in the area. A close-up of a family with a young handicapped child struggling to get educational services, or a feature on an existing program which is doing much good, but has long waiting lists, might stimulate public concern. Your press contacts may be interested in taking this on.

Letters to the Editor. These are another good way to get your issue before the public. Be specific. Be clear about what you are trying to change and why.

News stories. You may be participating in public hearings on the bill you are working for, or having an open house at your school to which you have invited your Congressman and the general public or you may be convening a meeting to discuss the issue or proposed legislation. In all these cases, you could send a news release describing the event to all the papers and stations and newsletters in your media notebook. It may be that the press will want to

follow up for themselves, based on information in your release. In rural areas most papers usually print what they get in the release. In that case, you may want to submit information after the event so you will be able to let the audience know what happened.

Talk shows. Make someone from your group available to be interviewed on the local radio or TV talk shows. Some data and some human interest stories, plus your statement of the problem, its causes and your remedy are the pieces of information you want to get across to listeners and viewers.

Speakers Bureau. You may decide to add a Speakers Bureau to your public education efforts. A couple of people throughout the state who are willing to go to other groups' meetings to present your issue are all you need to get started.

If it is important that your group or coalition be identified with a particular issue, be sure to mention the group name, a contact person and phone number in all your material.

Issues you are working on at the state level readily lend themselves to this type of media campaign. At the federal level, you may want to do some of the same things. One of the issues we worked on with local groups recently was to analyze the effects of the proposed budget cuts on children in their state or county. Some groups did basic research to find out the effects then arranged a press conference to get the information to the public. Others used the letters-to-the editor approach to get the word out. Some sent their findings to the mayor, county commissioners and their state and federal representative and got press coverage on and about that action. Do not shy away from the media. Seek it out. Cultivate contacts. Hone your skills in this area.

Build a communications system.

It is important to be able to get timely information out to your network as well as to get information from it in a short time. You might consider establishing a phone tree--in your Congressional district for national work, or in your state for work at that level. Essentially, a phone tree is a system that minimizes the number of phone calls any one person has to make (usually five) and cuts down on the time it takes to get information out. It requires a bit of maintenance to keep functioning in times when not much is happening at the statehouse or the Congress.

The phone tree is a pyramid-shaped system. To set one up is relatively simple. If you are the key person, you would phone five people in your network when something happens that requires an immediate response. You would give them the information and the action needed, for example, calls or letters to your Congressman before a vote comes up on an issue you care about. These five people would, in turn, phone five people each. And so on. Within several hours your entire network would know the information and you would have responses coming from them to your Congressman.

The phone tree can be used to get information too. You may need to know how people in the network feel about a particular proposal. You could ask for opinions via the phone tree; people could respond on postcards or via phone calls directly to you.

The phone tree should also be used to let people know how the situation they mobilized for turned out. What difference did the letters make? What did your elected official do? What happens next? People in your network need feedback on their actions. We all like to know what good our efforts produced. If we are to take action time and again, we want to know that some of it has paid off.

Newsletters are another communications tool; however, they can be a lot of work. You might consider a one page sheet that goes to your network on a periodic basis to keep people informed about the progress you are making towards reaching your goal.

Try out some new ways of operation.

A pen, paper, envelopes, stamps and the addresses of key elected officials are basic tools for you to carry around when you need to generate support for a particular piece of legislation. Constituent mail is an important factor in shaping the way an elected official examines an issue and ultimately votes. In Congress it is common to hear about how the mail is running. At the state level, five or six letters from a district on an issue make it a critical concern; state legislators simply do not get much mail.

To use letter writing effectively, do it in groups. Absolutely no one goes home after a meeting like this one and writes a letter. People will, however, write while in a meeting. Take a supply of envelopes and paper to every meeting you go to. Give the pitch about your issue and why it is important for people to speak up on it. Hand out the paper and envelopes and take 10 minutes to write as a group. From a meeting this size, you would generate 60 pieces of mail on an issue. You could charge a quarter per letter to help defray the cost of supplies and the stamp. Remember this--letters should be in the person's own words. Do not use a form letter; it is simply not effective.

Site visits. We can learn a lot from Head Start about how to make a children's program visible to an elected official. Head Start people are quite good at getting their representatives to visit programs. They have successfully sought expansion funds by presenting their case on site. The elected official has an opportunity to see what the program looks like, talk with consumers and directors, and decide if the dollars spent are worth the results.

If, for example, you seek state funds to expand pre-school programs, you might consider inviting your legislator to visit your program, to learn first-hand about what you are doing. Simultaneous visits by legislators to programs around the state will be a good first step in building a common knowledge base about your program and might be a good publicity strategy as well.

Public hearings. You may want to stage a public hearing to let your elected officials know the need for, or the effects of, proposed legislation or budget cuts. Invite the elected officials and the media. Line up people to present testimony to a citizens panel. You may want to focus on the need for pre-school programs in your community, for example. You could line up parents who need the services for their children, teachers, and professionals in the field to talk about the value of pre-school, the cost-effectiveness of early intervention, and other pertinent points. Hearings are a way of calling

public attention to your issue. Be sure, however, in planning one of these that you:

1) line up the speakers you want and ask them to cover specific aspects of the issue;
2) invite your elected officials and the press;
3) make sure others who have not been invited to testify have an opportunity to do so; and
4) pick a time and place that are appropriate to your issue.

You might want the hearing to be two weeks before a critical vote; you may want to hold it at a local school that would like a program but does not have the funds. Be creative.

Lastly --

Become involved in the political system.

The checkbook is an important tool in electoral politics. We have got to put our money on candidates we think will do the job for children. The rise of fund-distributing PAC's on the far right during the past several years indicates a need for us to financially support candidates who will, at the local, state and national levels, work on our issues.

Become involved in the local party of your choice. You might as a group develop a list of questions to ask each candidate. Find out their positions on education for handicapped children. It is better, I believe, to know where they are coming from before they are elected.

As an individual your opportunities to engage in active political work are wide open. As an employee of a non-profit, tax-exempt organization you are restricted, as you know. And your organization should stay out of direct political work.

The 1982 elections are rolling around quickly. Several congressmen and, no doubt, state elected officials are on endangered species lists. I encourage you to get involved in the electoral process. Volunteer some time to see that good people, critical decisive thinkers, are nominated and elected to represent you.

I realize this is quite a lot of ground to cover. The skills and techniques are transferable, learn them on one issue, enhance them on others. But start small. Do not do more than you are able to initially. These are fiscally conservative times. The gains for children will be small ones, but I think there will be gains. A child care tax credit bill has just passed in the New Mexico legislature and a Children's Trust Fund law has been enacted in Kansas. These are a few examples of the payoffs, from focused, well-organized local work.

I wish you all good luck--and success..

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

EFFECTIVE CHANGE IN RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES

EVERETT EDINGTON

Editor's Note: Dr. Edington's address is presented here as delivered at the workshop.

The previous numbered page in the original document was blank.

Effective Change in Rural Schools and Communities

Dr. Everett D. Edington
Director
ERIC/CRESS
New Mexico State University
Las Crusas, New Mexico

Presented to:
Second HCEEP Rural Workshop
Sheraton Century Center Hotel
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
June 10-12, 1981

A dilemma exists concerning public education's role in bringing about change within our social system. Should schools reflect the philosophies of the majority within a community, a state or the nation, or should they be instruments to bring about change within the system or even act in changing the structure of the system itself? In the past, the role of the public schools has generally been merely the reflection of the majority within the community, whether this reflection was religious, political or whatever. This view was accepted by both educators and the public.

Changes seem to be taking place not only among educators, but also within the public. Rarely does anyone go so far as to see the schools taking the role of changing the social structure, but the public does see the schools taking on the vital function of leadership, thus bringing about important changes within the existing social system.

In redefining this role it will be important for schools to restructure their systems for obtaining information used in decision-making. John I. Goodlad (1973) states, "In order to satisfy the different realms of decision making which will become a part of the role of the schools, . . . differing data sources must be brought into play for finding new solutions to problems." He suggests that educational institutions tend to draw their data from the safety of conventional wisdom, that schools are conservatively oriented, and that most controversial and potent thrusts of innovations are blunted.

Controversy over the purposes of the educational system is healthy. Without differences of opinion our schools would become stagnant and fail to meet the needs of our ever-changing society. This would also lead to control by a very few, who would be able to indoctrinate youth with their philosophies and thus, in a generation, would have one basic philosophy in complete control of the social system.

American society is at a point in time when important decisions concerning the future and direction of education must be made. Sterling M. McMurrin (1969), in Schools and the Challenge of Innovation, stated:

> But if many of these decisions are to be made in the future - the very near future - at least one major decision must be made now. It is the decision on whether to cling to the established educational habits and customs and thereby perpetuate the past or seize the opportunities of the present to break through those habits and customs and move in new directions.

For the educational reformer to be successful, he must not be so drastically divergent that the society will not listen to him and thus not accept his viewpoints. In order to survive an educational/political change, it is necessary to have what may be thought of as a map of the territory, together with some notion of the desirable direction and available paths. An educational change agent should also be aware of the practicality and applicability of a reform he advocates. It is extremely important that those advocating educational change have clearly in mind the goals of a society before attempting to initiate a change in their schools. It should also be kept in mind that change for change's sake should be avoided at all cost. The 1960's and 1970's were a time of rapid change with everyone jumping on the bandwagon for innovation. I predict the 1980's will be a time of change for improvement in the quality of education.

Rural schools will be among the most rapid to change, as they have been among the slowest to change in the past. We will see them catching up with many of the advances made by their urban and suburban counterparts in the last two decades. They will have the opportunity of learning from the mistakes that urban and suburban schools have made, and should be able to adopt only those innovations that meet the particular needs of rural areas.

Community characteristics which influence change are closely related to the characteristics of individuals who influence change. Thus communities with higher levels of education and socio-economic status will be more likely to accept innovation. Communities that are more cosmopolitan in nature will be more willing to accept innovation within the schools. Communities with these characteristics will not only be willing to accept such change, but will demand that improvements be made and that the school be a dynamic force in the social structure.

In rural America, we see a phenomenon of reverse migration taking place. Throughout the 1960's and early 1970's, a large number of people migrated to the urban areas, and thus we saw steady declines in rural populations. However, in the past six to eight years, this migration has been reversed and in a great many rural communities we see growth taking place. It is interesting to note that the people coming to these communities are generally of a higher level of education and somewhat higher socio-economic status than many of the long-term residents. The first area in which they see the opportunity of making changes is in the schools. Many of them are getting elected to school boards, and by relying on this type of power are making changes within the communities. They also expect the same types of services they had in the urban or suburban schools which they left. This is causing frustation in many of the rural citizens, who are unable to cope with the rapid changes taking place.

Extreme social unrest within a community may in some cases act as a deterrent to change. When school administrators have to lock gates at the schools and police the halls to protect the students, staff and property, it is extremely difficult to have a viable educational program. It is important that there be a dialogue between the community and school personnel, although in some cases there may be confrontation. This confrontation should not be destructive in nature,

but should involve issues to be solved at the negotiating table or at the polling place during school board elections. In the past, school board members have generally represented the power structure or special interest groups. Such persons were content to maintain the status quo in the schools. State legislators often represent the same groups of people. If others in the various communities want more of a voice in what happens in the schools, they must work within the system to get representation in both local and state legislatures and policymaking bodies. This change is beginning to take place in some communities, making the schools more susceptible to changes desired by the various groups living in the school district.

While there is a vast difference in the characteristics of rural schools, the main similarities are in smallness and degree of isolation. Due to the smaller administrations and fewer people in positions of authority, it is sometimes easier to bring about change in rural schools than in urban schools, even though rural schools have been historically slower to change. The change agent should take advantage of the smallness of the schools and the smaller number of people to work with in order to effect change in the rural community. There is even some idea that the assumption that rural schools are the most difficult to change may be only a myth. In practice, however, the small rural school has often been ignored by policymakers at the state and national level. A good example is the National Center for Educational Statistics, which does not even collect data on schools of 300 or less. With the block grants for education advocated by the Reagan administration going into effect, it is extremely important that small schools focus on the state level in order to gain necessary funds to bring about change. This might be easier for them than influencing the large bureaucratic programs that have come out of Washington in the past.

A major research effort to study the change process in rural schools was the Rural Experimental Schools Program, financed by the National Institute of Education. Ten rural school districts were part of a five-year program through which change was introduced. An anthropologist or sociologist lived in each community and documented the process, both in the school and in the community. Abt Associates of Cambridge, Massachusetts had the study contract and was responsible for this major evaluation effort (Herriott, 1979). Characteristics of rural schools which affected their willingness to accept change were as follows:

1. <u>The multiple functions of rural schools</u>. Generally in the rural communities, the school is often the center of the social life and other activities within the community. It is often an accepted fact that much of the entertainment for the community is provided by or in the school.

2. <u>The tension between stability and change in rural communities</u>. The power structure within the rural community generally has much more immediate contact with the school than it would in urban areas. Quite often this power structure desires stability, and change can often disrupt the status quo and cause tension. The change agent must identify this power structure and be able to work within it, to bring about change and still have a type of stability.

3. The recentness and circumstances of school district consolidation. Consolidation has been a thorn in the side of rural people for some time. Often it has been a barrier to proper change. Many times, whether to consolidate or not becomes the issue, rather than whether the consolidation would bring about more quality education. In some cases it would, and in many cases it would not.

4. The size, geographic dispersion, and population density of rural school districts. Recently, I was at a meeting in Kentucky where an administrator complained that this rural district covered 50 square miles. I was amused at this being considered an isolated and large geographic district, as I am also acquainted with a district in northern New Mexico that covers 1740 square miles. Ninety-eight percent of the students are bused an average of 47 miles, one-way. These students are located in seven different schools and the total school population in the district K-12 is 508 students. Vast distances like this make change very difficult at times.

5. The heterogeneous nature of rural populations. As has been mentioned earlier in this paper, there is a recent tendency for reverse migration to rural areas. This causes the population within these rural areas to have a number of different characteristics. Depending on the issues, this may help or hinder change.

6. The limited and precarious economic base. In many states, the local tax base provides a large part of the support for the rural schools. Some states are changing this. About 25 states in the nation now have special support formulas for providing funds for rural schools. Many of these rural districts must have more state support before they will have the economic base necessary for supporting innovation and change (Wright, 1981).

7. Rural fears of federal colonialism. Last year the U.S. Department of Education sponsored a series of 10 workshops around the nation to determine the feelings of rural people about the types of assistance that should come from the federal level. In many cases, they found a strong bias against federal intervention in education and many of the rural communities in essence said, "Do not mess with our schools; leave us to make our own decisions."

8. The shifting balance of power and authority among rural teachers, administrators, and school boards. Rural schools are the latest to feel the pressures of unionized teachers. Most rural school boards, school superintendents and administrators still do not know how to deal with collective negotiations. Many times the teachers bring in their professional negotiator from the State Education Association, while the local administration and the board are left to flounder for themselves.

9. Citizens' reservations about the professional authority of teachers. Teachers are no longer the most respected people in the rural communities, so there is a reluctance to accept the authority of the teacher. This is because of a number of changes introduced into the curriculum of rural schools, which may be in direct opposition to the felt needs of the community.

It should be pointed out that the amount of change that has occurred in rural schools in unimpressive, compared to the amount of financial aid and human resources devoted to change efforts over the past decade. With these resources drying up, it is even more important that change be well-planned in order to meet the educational needs and objectives of the community. One important aspect of change in rural schools and rural communities is the recognition that the local community and the staff of the school must be involved in the change process and planning. Deal and Nutt (1979) found that if desired changes are to take place in the community, it is important that local people, both in the school and the community, be involved from planning to implementation; the addition of money alone is not the answer. It may well be that the most effective change is that accomplished with existing financial resources.

Alvin Toffler (1975), in The Eco-Spasm Report, stressed two principles for coping with world crises: (1) economics alone cannot solve the crises, and (2) the past cannot (and should not) be recaptured. These two principles could well be applied to changing schools in rural America. A common mistake is to believe that money alone can solve everything. Not only is this an entirely erroneous philosophy, but the nation is in a time of limited resources; one of the most important tasks facing the educational decision maker is the proper allocation of current funds, rather than planning to utilize new money in change programs. The second principle also holds true for rural schools. There are vocal groups who advocate going completely backward to one-room schools. I would much rather look forward and discover more effective ways of developing sound basic educational programs.

References

Deal, T.E. & Nutt, S.C. Promoting, guiding and surviving change in school districts. Cambridge, Ma: Abt Associates, Inc., 1979.

Goodlad, J.I. (Ed.), Shane, H.G., & Richey, H.G. The elementary school in the United States. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Herriott, R.E. Federal initiative and rural school improvement: Findings from the experimental schools program. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, September, 1980.

James, T. et al. Schools and the challenge of innovation. Introduction by Sterling McMurrin. New York: McGraw Hill, 1969.

Wright, L.O. Special funding for small and/or isolated rural schools. Las Cruces, New Mexico: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, New Mexico State University, 1981.

Toffler, A. The eco-spasm report. New York: Bantam Books, 1975.

SYNOPSIS OF HCEEP RURAL WORKSHOP
TOPICAL SESSIONS

Topic: Transition into Public Schools: Workshop

Presenters: Patricia Hutinger, Director
Outreach: Macomb 0-3 Regional Project
27 Horrabin Hall
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois 61455

Vanda Black, Preschool Coordinator
West Central Illinois Special Education Cooperative
323 West Washington
Macomb, Illinois 61455

Marilyn Frank, Director
Project C.H.A.R.T.
311 Oglebay Hall
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Procedures for Transition Into Public Schools (Hutinger)

Insights into the problems, solutions and realm of procedures used to move handicapped youngsters from one program into a new one are of critical importance to those working in early childhood handicapped programs and a topic frequently discussed by leaders in the field. As future directions in programming for handicapped young children are examined, attention to the development and implementation of specific, effective transition practices must be an integral part of the provision of services to children and their families.

Transition practices are defined as those strategies and procedures which are planned and employed to insure the smooth placement and subsequent adjustment of the child as he/she moves from one program into another; for example, from an early childhood handicapped program to a regular kindergarten, a preschool room, or a primary special education classroom. The results of a comprehensive Illinois study demonstrated that at least in that state, transition practices at best tend to be isolated and fragmented in reality, and at worst are nonexistent (Hutinger & Swartz, 1980). Data collected from six nationally known First Chance programs indicated that they were able to provide more careful attention to follow-up procedures used in the transition process than other programs.

A variety of factors affect the quality of transition practices, not the least being the amount of time personnel have during each day to engage in the multitude of activities required in a program serving young handicapped children. Personnel in programs for older children usually do not have the luxury of extensive available time to do all the things they know need to be accomplished. Nevertheless, program personnel must attend to a number of variables related to effective transitioning to insure maximal child growth.

Procedures for Transition Recommended by a Panel of Experts in Early Childhood (Hutinger, 1981)

1. The receiving teacher should make observational visits in the child's early childhood program prior to transition.
2. Inservice and conferences for both parents and early childhood staff need to be provided at the beginning of the transition year.

3. Parents and early childhood staff should be involved in the child's annual IEP review.
4. Competencies for entry into kindergarten and primary programs need to be determined. The criteria should influence the preschool handicapped program.
5. Smooth progression from program to program involves:
   a. Developing a good communication system between early childhood handicapped (ECH) programs and primary and kindergarten programs.
   b. Transition can be built into the ECH curriculum so there is a gradual change in classroom procedures.
6. Effective coordination needs to be established between ECH programs and primary and kindergarten programs.
7. Additional training and inservice needs to be established for regular educators. The receiving teacher should know the curriculum, teaching strategies and instructional procedures which were used in the ECH class.
8. The ECH teacher should provide direct follow-up and have knowledge of available resources that can be used by the receiving teacher.
9. The child should be asked to participate in the transition choice - receive program alternatives before a final decision is made.
10. Good records on child progress is essential.
11. Administrative involvement in transition is essential.
12. Professionals working on transition need to have an integrated approach and general understanding of the work of other professionals involved with the child.
13. Parents should be trained as "advocates" for their child.
14. Follow-up procedures are of critical importance.
    a. The receiving teacher must be offered follow-up services.
    b. Child data should be provided.
    c. A follow-up time line or schedule should be established.
    d. Provide support for teachers through the use of adjunctive ancillary services.
15. Paid, trained advocates are needed to assume the role, responsibility, activities and coordination of the transition procedure. (However, the source of funding for such an advocate is a problem.)
16. Opportunities for both formal and informal interaction between sending and receiving teachers are essential for effective transition.

References

Hutinger, P.L. Transitional practices for handicapped young children: what the experts say. Division of Early Childhood, The Council for Exceptional Children, 1981.

Hutinger, P. and Swartz, S. Executive Summary: Illinois Early Childhood Handicapped Research Study. Springfield, Illinois: State Board of Education, 1980.

Transition Into Least Restrictive Environments (Franks)

A seven stage assessment process is typically followed in determining appropriate placement for the handicapped child. The model presented here

takes this process a step further: before an immediate placement is made, the next, less restrictive placement is identified and specific goals are then established so the child will be taught the prerequisite skills to enter that next environment.

Identifying and referring occurs when someone (parent, social worker, friend) thinks the child may have a problem and contacts the Local Education Administration (LEA). Screening occurs to determine whether the child does have a problem, and to gather relevant information. Then a more in-depth assessment is made, to determine deviation from normal or from requirements of the present environment, thus establishing present status.

During the placing stage, the child's future (less restrictive) environment (and possible alternatives) are examined. Minimum entry requirements of the environments are determined (for example, kindergarten teachers are asked to determine minimum skills, behaviors expected of any child who enters their class). The next "best choice" environment is selected at the Interdisciplinary Staffing Individual Education Program (IEP) meeting and preliminary long range goals are identified. Long range goals are skills to be acquired before entering the next environment. If a child is three, he/she has two years to meet those goals before entering a kindergarten placement, for example. A best placement is assigned (if alternatives exist) at which the child receives instruction toward the long range goals.

Before the teacher begins instructing, he/she does an in-depth assessment of the child's present level of functioning in different areas (gross motor, dressing, social interaction, etc.). The number of objectives between the present level of functioning and the long range goals are determined (using a specific curriculum). The total objectives are divided by the number of years to the long range goals (two years, in our example), which yields number of objectives to the annual goal. Monthly goals are established by dividing objectives to the annual goal by the number of months the child will receive instruction that year (typically, this is nine months). Short-term objectives are the first objectives to be taught, which immediately follow the present level of functioning.

Monitoring of the child's progress is on-going. Data is collected on objectives as they are taught and mastered. The teacher and his/her supervisor examine the data regularly to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction and to determine necessary teaching techniques or objectives are altered to maximize effectiveness of instruction.

Usually, the child's progress is examined on an annual basis with the next, less restrictive environment in mind. Any necessary programming adjustments are made and written into the IEP, thus re-establishing status of the child's educational program.

This process is continuous for the duration of the child's education. The next, less restrictive environment is always determined with the plan that the final environment allows independent functioning within the community.

Public School Administrators' Concerns On Transition Into Public Schools (Black)

Public school administrators are in a difficult and challenging position in their role in a child's transition into public schools from 0-3 or 0-5 early childhood handicapped programs. The primary reason for this difficulty and challenge is the lack of coordination and planning for the child between the public schools and the early childhood handicapped (ECH) programs.

The following 13 points are concerns that need to be considered by public school administrators, teachers and directors of ECH programs.

1. Often times parents who request birth to three programs need professional guidance in seeking kinds of service to avoid splintered approach.
2. 0-3 services seem to be based on medical support services (or mental health).
3. Parents being served by 0-3 may be advised on medical needs rather than the educational needs of the child.
4. Role of school is often not clearly defined to the agency and parents of a 0-3 or 0-5 child.
5. Parents usually have a very close personal contact with the 0-3 programs because they are with the child as services are being given. However, when they enter public school programs this changes. Parents may become distrustful because they feel they are no longer an important part of their child's program.
6. Schools often make the mistake of not developing basic curricular goals and defining the limitations of their programs.
7. Agencies work autonomously to each other rather than cooperatively, and this reflects an overlapping of services (are we cost efficient in this). This may force parents to choose what they perceive as the "best", therefore, creating a great deal of conflict in parents and among agencies.
8. Schools follow ISBE Rules and Regulations. Parents (at times) are led to believe that because 0-3 recommends it, it must be so.
9. Schools and other agencies must learn to pursue ALTERNATIVES of service and to make maximum use of a minimum of resources.
10. After the child enters school and becomes a student, the role of the 0-3 worker is unclear. At times they appear to take on the role of an ADVOCATE or WATCHDOG to insure that the teacher is doing what 0-3 teachers want.
11. Can the parent shop around for services? In our area some have been led to believe they can. In Illinois the R & R's state the decision for special education services must be made at a multi-disciplinary staffing and that parents and public school personnel must reach a consensus on placement and IEP goals.
12. Separation of child from parent - we do an inadequate job of preparing parents for this and in follow-up. Need to define roles and responsibilities of all involved to achieve a smooth transition.
13. How do we look at the total child and determine priorities in relation to the long range goals of independence?

If the teachers, parents, public school administrators, and directors of ECH programs actively participate in planning the child's transition from one program to another, the cooperation would lead toward implementation of procedures that work best for all concerned. The use of the following checklist for transition into public schools would help insure that the process be smoothly transpired.

Checklist for Transition Into Public Schools

	Parent Training	Case Study	Other Agencies	Related Services	Curri-culum	Interim Services	Trans-portation
Teachers							
Parents							
Child							
Administration							
Related							

Topic: Interagency Coordination: State Success Stories

Presenters: Christine B. Bartlett
Early Childhood Consultant
Division of Special Education
Maine Dept. of Educational
and Cultural Services
State House Station #23
Augusta, Maine 04333

Sharyl R. Gottschalk
SIG Director
Section for Special Education
R.F. Kneip Office Building
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

The purpose of this session was to share some information on successful state practices in interagency coordination in selected states, and to provide an opportunity for participants to identify particular problems which concerned them, as well as linking them up to appropriate resources to help resolve the identified problems.

The presenters provided a framework for determining how and when a state should get involved in interagency coordination. Problems were identified by individual participants, as were general problems which any interagency effort might face. The identification of resources to resolve problems was discussed by the presenters.

Interagency Collaboration in Maine (Bartlett)

Maine Law (Title 20, MRSA, Chapter 406) provides for a grant program at the discretion of the Commissioner to support coordination of services to handicapped children between the ages of three and five. This law, passed in April, 1980, was the culmination of a three year pilot program to develop a system for coordinating preschool handicapped services. The pilot phase was supported by Maine's first State Implementation Grant, two years of Preschool Incentive Grant funds, and two years of State Appropriations. It involved (and still involves) three state departments in the program - the Departments of Educational and Cultural Services, Mental Health and Corrections, and Human Services.

At the state level, the program is operated by the Interdepartmental Coordinating Committee for Preschool Handicapped Children. The fourteen members of the Committee represent the three departments, three parents of handicapped children appointed by the departments, and representatives of Maine Head Start Directors' Association and The Association for Young Children with Special Needs. The Committee is responsible for selecting grant recipients, approving continuation funding, monitoring and evaluation of the grant sites, and providing technical assistance to the local programs. In addition, they take the primary responsibility for state coordination activities which currently include developing regulations for the new legislation, developing written agreements at the state level to facilitate the local coordinated efforts, and developing standards and guidelines for programs participating in the coordination effort. There are currently seven programs funded in the state; a plan for gradual expansion of the system state-wide will be developed during the coming year.

At the local level, the program is governed by Local Coordinating Committees, made up of regional/local offices of the three departments, at least two LEA's, other public and private providers of services to preschool handicapped children, and parents. Each program must have a fiscal agent to act as recipient of the funds (six of the seven current fiscal agents are school districts), and must hire at least a full-time coordinator and a part-time secretary to carry out the program. The four components of the system are:

1. to coordinate existing screening programs;
2. to coordinate existing diagnostic/evaluation services;
3. to coordinate existing direct service programs for identified children; and
4. to coordinate planning to eliminate duplication, develop needed new programs, or to augment existing programs in the first three areas.

The focus of the effort is on developing a systematic approach in the given geographical area, assuring that existing state and local services are appropriately and fully utilized prior to developing new programs and using grant funds to pay for services to children.

Two evaluations of the program, one in the spring of 1979 and one recently completed, indicate that the approach has had a high degree of success in improving and increasing available services for identifying and serving handicapped children between the ages of three and five. There has been moderate to good success in decreasing duplication, and increasing coordination between/among area service providers. One indicator of the success of the approach is the increase in children eligible to be counted for the Federal Child Count, from 688 in December, 1977, to 1,448 in December, 1980. Not all of these children are served through the coordination programs, but they represent a significant percent of the increase.

Interagency Collaboration in South Dakota (Gottschalk)

South Dakota Law (SDCL 13-37-1) states that children in need of special assistance or prolonged assistance means all children under the age of twenty-one who are residents of the state of South Dakota, and who, because of their physical or mental conditions are not adequately provided for through the usual facilities and services of the public school. The law also states that all public schools must provide "appropriate educational services" for all children in need of special or prolonged assistance, under twenty-one years of age. State Special Education Rules further define the law by stating that programs for children under the age of three years shall be provided only to those children who are in need of prolonged assistance.

Local education agencies (LEA's) are responsible for serving all pre-school handicapped children. This does not necessarily mean that the school district has to have an actual early childhood handicapped program. An LEA does have the option to coordinate with existing early childhood programs such as Head Start programs, parent-child centers, and private state approved preschool programs.

South Dakota Law (SDCL 13-37-1.2) places regulatory and coordinating authority for special education with the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education. As a result of this law, the South Dakota State Education Agency has assumed the leadership role in state-wide inter-agency activities.

South Dakota is a rural state and lacks the abundance of economic resources. School districts find it extremely difficult to expand or initiate special services under these conditions. The role of the Section for Special Education is one of identifying and coordinating with other agencies that provide, or have the potential to provide, services to the young handicapped child.

The Section for Special Education believes that the development of interagency agreements is necessary to assure smooth cooperation between agencies and programs. Agreements should be designed to identify each agency's role and responsibility in identifying, evaluating, and serving young handicapped children.

The South Dakota State Education Agency has entered into agreements with other state agencies, regional agencies, and private facilities. The reason for the development of existing agreements was either: 1) to clarify different agencies roles and responsibilities; 2) to resolve an apparent conflict; or 3) to assure the continuation of smooth cooperation between agencies in the case that one or more key persons involved leaves the agency.

Interagency coordination and commitment must be present at all levels - federal, regional, state, and local. South Dakota continues to develop agreements at the state level, but they are also encouraging local school districts to develop agreements. One local district is entering into agreements with Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) schools, BIA contract schools, Social Services, Indian Health Services, and reservation head starts and parent-child centers. Another local district is in the process of developing agreements with private hospitals, a state college, Mental Health, and Head Start programs.

There have been positive efforts across the state to provide services to preschool handicapped children. It is essential that the Section for Special Education provide the leadership in coordinating services state-wide. The development of interagency agreements has provided, and will continue to provide, the leadership necessary to appropriately serve all children in need of special or prolonged assistance.

Topic: Affecting Rural State and Federal Policy: Discussion Group

Discussion Leader: Louise Phillips
Magnolia School District #14
P.O. Box 428
Magnolia, Arkansas 71753

Filling in for Barbara Zang (who was scheduled to lead the discussion group the morning after her opening keynote address, but had to inadvertently return to Washington), Louise Phillips led a discussion concerning the roles that federally funded infant projects can and can not take in lobbying to maintain federal monies for early childhood handicapped programs.

Ms. Phillips advised the project directors and staff to steer clear of using monies allocated to their projects to lobby their congressmen because of the unlawfulness of using federal dollars to influence legislation. However, she did emphasize that there are ways to lawfully and effectively make our voices heard concerning what happens to the dollars that now support infant projects, that we can make an impact. We just have to be very careful to play by the rules.

One course we can all follow, she explained, is to use people who are not directly involved in (or paid by) the project to do the lobbying We must let the parents of the children we serve, the projects' advocates and friends know how essential it is that they write their congressmen about the necessity for and the effectiveness of the early childhood handicapped programs. Phillips stressed though that even in pursuing this means of making our voices heard, we must be careful. She cited an example of an infant project which wished to inform its parents, friends and supporters of the need to write legislators. In their desire to accomplish this as quickly and effectively as possible, the project staff chose to inform its suporters of the need to write via the project newsletter. In the newsletter (which was written, copied and mailed with federal funds), the staff laid out the message that needed to be written to the congressmen, gave names and addresses of those congressmen who would be most beneficial to impact and even gave the format to be followed. This approach to lobbying was not within the legal guidelines.

What we can do as project directors and staff is to send out factual materials concerning the federal budget breakdown, the voting records of legislators, the pieces of legislation which are up for vote and the changes that are being made. If this is done in an objective, non-opinionated manner, we are not going against regulations. We are letting the voters make up their own minds; we are just providing them with the facts that will illustrate what is taking place.

Phillips also suggested that we maintain close and constant contact with the media. Let them know of our activities, have them on hand when we have a workshop, conference, or fund-raising event. Provide them with a human interest story. The public thrive on these stories and this advances our position as a worthwhile and necessary service to the community.

Working for our representatives and senators before election time as private citizens on our own time is an effective way to ensure their support once they are in office, Phillips suggested. Whether we give time, money or both, when we later approach them as representatives of our projects, our efforts will be remembered and appreciated.

A group interchange closed the discussion with Phillips monitoring the suggestions and questions from the participants. More specific and indepth means of influeincing legislators to support infant projects are found in the 1981 Rural Monograph entitled Let's Go Rural: Influencing Decision Makers, coordinated by Louise Phillips.

Topic: Rural Service Delivery Strategies That Work: Innovative Models

Presenters: Jimmye Gowling, Director
Project: SEARCH
415 West Avenue N
Silsbee, Texas 77656

James Pezzino, Director
Service and Demonstration
Montana University Affiliated
Program
University of Montana
Social Science Building
Missoula, Montana 59801

Prenatal Class for High Risk Mothers (Gowling)

Project: SEARCH conducts a weekly class for pregnant teenagers in the Silsbee Independent School District. These classes are conducted by the project nurse whose background includes 10 years experience in the Labor and Delivery Unit of Baptist Hospital, Beaumont, Texas. The purpose of this class is to provide the high-risk mother with enough information and encouragement that the result is a healthy newborn with prospects for improved quality of life because the mother realizes that mothering begins before the baby arrives.

Organization

Currently the R.N. conducts 90-minute weekly classes at both campuses. At the first class meeting the students receive a syllabus, a description of the grading system, and fill out necessary forms. Students must submit a written statement from their physician which verifies their pregnancy, grants approval for participation in class activities (exercises, etc.), and indicates the expected date of delivery.

The grading system requires a pre/post test of each unit of study. Students are also graded on assigned classwork. Students who miss class are allowed to make up the work. The grades earned in the prenatal class are averaged into the grades the student receives in the regular class she attends during this period for the remainder of the week. Sometimes students' schedules are rearranged so that they have this class during a time which the student body is allowed for school activities such as the Math Club or other student organizational meetings.

Referrals

Most referrals come through the school nurse or another student. The students contact the counselor who then arranges the students' schedules so that they can be enrolled. Referrals, however, come from other sources as well, such as teachers, parents and people in the community. As soon as a student is referred, the R.N. gets the necessary releases signed for class participation and has the student sign a contract regarding the grading system. Students also agree to have the newborn screened by Project: SEARCH.

Course Content

Curriculum for the prenatal class is divided into five major areas:

1) Introduction and General Information
2) Self Care During Pregnancy
3) Nutrition During Pregnancy
4) Preparing for Labor and Delivery
5) After Baby Comes . . .

The R.N. develops the curriculum and student workbooks which are used in class or for home assignment. Some makeup work is arranged by the R.N. at the school on a day other than the regularly scheduled day for the prenatal class.

Students are enrolled in this class at an interval during the school year; therefore, it is important that the classes be individualized and some portions of the curriculum are almost self-instructive.

Special films and a field trip to the delivery room and neonatal nursery of a nearby hospital are also part of the course and these special events are open to other students in the Home and Family classes of the high school.

Special Considerations

For those who may wish to establish a similar class, the following considerations should be weighed:

Time restrictions. Semester changes, class time limitations and absenteeism affect course schedule and content.
Classroom space. This class needs a large room for exercises with some degree of privacy.
Age and intellectual levels. These vary so widely; however, with the notebook, good demonstrations and individualized instruction, these variables can be overcome.
Gift packs. Prenatal and newborn gift packs have great appeal to the teenage mother.
Administrators. Solid evidence of need and a cooperative spirit are top priorities toward obtaining permission and support for this type of class.

Rural Service Delivery Strategies for the Handicapped (Pezzino)

This presentation addressed several rural service delivery strategies appropriate for the handicapped that have been or are in the process of being implemented by the Montana University Affiliated Program (MUAP).

The Montana UAP for Developmental Disabilities is one of more than forty programs in the country funded to provide specialized resources to service systems for handicapped persons. The mission and state-wide goals of the MUAP focus on the following:

1. The development and demonstration of model and exemplary service programs for the developmentally disabled;
2. The accomplishment of personnel preparation activities;

3. The development of an information-base in support of technical services and research; and
4. The dissemination of information to administrators and practitioners.

The following rural service delivery strategies are presented here to exemplify this organization's responsiveness to a state-wide challenge to positively impact developmentally disabled persons and agencies:

1. MUAP Administrative Structure
2. Telecommunication Technology
3. Instructional Technology
4. Interagency Cooperation
5. Itinerant Service Delivery Strategy
6. Information Management and Dissemination

Topic: Staff Training for Rural Personnel

Presenters: Joyce Evans
Southwest Educational
Development Laboratory
211 East Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Denese Pillans
DEBT Outreach Teacher-Trainer
DEBT Lubbock Independent School
District
1628 19th Street
Lubbock, Texas 79401

Effective Inservice Training (Evans)

Effective inservice training is a critical special education need in rural areas. Teachers are often assigned to classes for which they were not preservice trained or they may have children with problems which they are not prepared to handle. Inservice is their primary means of gaining new skills.

Effective inservice requires assessing teacher needs, planning training to meet individual and group needs, conducting training (not just a lecture), and assessing the results to begin the planning and training cycle again.

Assessment

Assessment should be an integral, on-going part of inservice, including: (1) assessing initial needs, (2) assessing inservice options, (3) assessing inservice results, and (4) assessing future or additional needs.

Assessing initial needs is too often a matter of assessing the needs of administrators, principals or supervisors, or their perceptions of the needs of teachers. Teachers themselves must be included in assessing their needs. This does not have to be a complex process--it can be done quite simply. The most obvious way is to question, to ask teachers, "What do you want to learn?" Interviewing teachers, which takes longer, involves asking teachers to describe their needs and the types of information they need in more detail. Classroom observation, followed by talking with teachers, is another approach. Written surveys are often used. This approach can be effective if it is not biased or limited by the questions or the way the survey is written.

Assessing inservice options is another type of information necessary for planning. Nearly every locale has some type of resources, but sometimes these are overlooked. Non-public school agencies such as public health, mental health/mental retardation centers, and medical associations often have information and expertise which can add to possible inservice options.

Planning

Planning involves knowing the needs, knowing the options, and selecting the options which meet individual and group needs. Inservice options might include: individual consultation, reference material (books, pamphlets, materials), observation of other teachers, observation in other

centers or agencies, attending conferences, or teaming with another teacher as well as employment of a consultant or conducting a day of training.

Planning may include selecting a consultant to address common needs of groups of teachers. However, consultants should be selected with care. Some consultants are best able to entertain or inspire the listeners; others are excellent lecturers on topics of general interest or on highly specialized topics; others are excellent at leading group discussions or problem solving sessions; some are adept at demonstrating with children or materials; and some are "trainers," able to use a variety of adult teaching strategies to convey information at a practical level.

The area of expertise, the consultants' knowledge of a specific area, is important but equally important is the manner in which that information is conveyed. The consultants' knowledge and communication style or delivery of information must be matched with the needs of teachers.

Training

Training, the actual period of time participants are gathered together to learn new information, should include a variety of format options, not just lecture. Adults learn more easily when they are able to see and participate as well as listen. Although adults have learned to sit courteously and pretend to listen, it is difficult to concentrate and learn through listening for more than 15 or 20 minutes at a time. Therefore, passive or inactive format options should be alternated with active ones to hold attention. Possible format options might include: role play, demonstration, group experiences, discussion, independent activities or assignments, simulation, or audio-visuals.

Training provides an opportunity which often overlooked--that of helping participants become better acquainted with each other as individuals and as resources. This is particularly important in rural areas in which teachers need to draw on the expertise of each other. When teachers begin exchanging teaching ideas and information among themselves, the trainer can feel that he or she has helped them along the road to helping each other.

Assessing training should occur during and following the actual training. Participants' comments and questions during the training can often provide a guide for future inservice. Post session evaluations with questions such as "Did you like the session?" or "Was the room comfortable?" are rather standard but provide little information about what was learned. If criterion referenced tests are not used, it is helpful to at least include an open-ended item or two such as "List the three most important points of this session" or "List three new ideas which you can use."

Assessing, planning, training--it is a cycle which must be continuous if inservice is to be effective.

Training Volunteers as Home Teachers (Pillans)

Developmental Education Birth through Two (DEBT) Outreach Program proposes to train personnel to develop home-based programs which will provide comprehensive services to parents of very young handicapped children.

Recruitment of Volunteers

Recruitment of volunteers is one of the major components of the service delivery strategy. The awareness campaign starts with the DEBT Newsletter and introduction of the Outreach Program to all interested parties. Personal contact is made with each area's school superintendent and health providers. Key contact people are located, and DEBT presentations are set up with PTA's, social and civic organizations, study clubs, and informal small group meetings. A corp of individuals interested in participating in outreach training is identified. The most essential qualification is love of children. Volunteers range from parents of handicapped children, parents of normal children, grandparents, foster parents, nurses, retired teachers, social workers, and others. Each come with his/her own area of expertise, adding interest and variety to each session.

Training Component

The training design provides 24 hours of preservice training, follow-up visits, evaluation of replication programs, and dissemination of materials and information. The training component has two purposes: 1) that persons participating in the training workshops will acquire the basic competencies needed for identifying young handicapped children, with particular focus on the early years, as well as an understanding of services available within the educational framework; and 2) that educators and volunteers will become knowledgeable of services provided through various social services, medical and private agencies for families seeking help which will enhance the well being of the handicapped infant.

The training times are flexible, giving consideration to the volunteers' schedules. The choice arrangement has been four hours a day, two days a week for three weeks. A continuous week presents too much new material, while one day a week spreads over too long a period.

The first session starts with a Memorandum of Agreement. It is signed by the DEBT Outreach Training Staff (DOTS) and the site volunteers. It includes a statement of objectives and evaluation. This written agreement serves as a bond, a commitment.

Pre- and post-tests are administered to measure the competencies of the volunteers, as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of the training. The training notebook is introduced with particular attention paid to the glossary and the medical nomenclature. The "jargon" of the training sessions, whether medical or educational, is often new to volunteers. The training sessions include informal discussions using multi-sensory techniques ranging from mini-lectures, video tapes, slides, filmstrips, observation and direct training experience. Open discussion allows for each trainee (some of whom are parents of a special child) to share his or her own personal experiences and knowledge. The areas covered in the sessions are: high risk factors, normal and abnormal development, handicapping conditions, physical management, assessments, curricula and educational planning, and parent training.

Field training follows the formal training sessions, giving volunteers the opportunity of gaining first hand experience. The volunteers make a visit to the DEBT office where they are paired with DEBT teachers for home visits. On field day they receive an overview and tour major facilities in the area serving the handicapped. The documentation system

outlined in the DEBT G.O.S.P.E.L. (Guidebook of Objectives for Systematic Procedures through Efficiency and Logic) is reviewed.

Monthly meetings called by the volunteer coordinator are held at each site. At the meetings new children are assigned, assessment data is collected, successes and difficulties are discussed, and any newly developed related service or agency is introduced. Volunteers learn to work together, to trust their judgement, to be flexible, adaptable and creative. Each comes with their own unique talents and each take to a family a combination of love, talent, knowledge and concern.

The volunteers help to turn the cogs of the wheel. Their work increases community awareness, thus recruiting more volunteers to be trained. These dedicated people make community presentations and provide site activity up-dates at area meetings. These DEBT Replication Sites would not be able to continue without the volunteers and the cycling effect they play on that community.

Topic: Securing Funds: Three Hour Workshop

Introduction: Sharon Kiefer, Coordinator
CDR Outreach Project
P.O. Box 299
Lightfoot, Virginia 23090

Presenters: Corinne Garland
Rural Network Coordinator
14942 Bramblewood
Houston, TX 77024

Jane Weil, Director
Washington County
Children's Program
Outreach Project
P.O. Box 311
Machia, Maine 04654

Arthur Moreau, President
Division of Innovation and
Development
Continuing Education Programs
of America
P.O. Box 52
Peoria, Illinois 61650

Securing Funds in Rural Communities (Garland)

This portion of the workshop was designed to debunk the mythology which surrounds fund raising, and to make participants aware of the fund raising skills they, as educators, already possess. These include needs assessment, selecting strategies, implementation and evaluation. The planning process was stressed as critical to a successful fund raising campaign.

Participants were encouraged to follow a fund raising process which includes the steps which were outlined as follows:

Define the Need

Three questions must be answered in definition of need: What for? How much? and For how long? What is it you are seeking funds for? Prepare a clear statement of your purpose. How much is it you need for your program? Translate the program into dollars. A simple calculation of the service you provide, less your assessment of funds currently available to support your project will result in a clear statement of financial need. Is your need a one-time situation or is it ongoing? Or are you only asking for start-up money, after which you will secure other sources of funding? If this is the case, you will want to have, along with your statement of need, a plan for obtaining additional sources of funds.

Identify Responsible Persons

It is important to identify the person(s) who will be responsible for securing funds to meet those needs. Perhaps this is the administrative staff of your agency or maybe an administrative board given the task of securing funds with which the staff can carry out the program. Or you can consider the possibility of using a volunteer group or maybe the task is of such size that it requires the services of a professional fund raiser.

Identify Available Resources

With someone securely at the head of your fund raising campaign, examine your potential resources to assist in the process. Begin with those who already have an affiliation with your agency or school and a commitment to its long-range goals. Work from this nucleus outward, turning to your community at large to survey its resources most carefully. While few rural communities have professional fund raisers in their midst, make sure not to overlook the development office of a nearby college, private school, or hospital. Every community has its financial experts, its bankers and accountants, who can review your financial plan to see if it is feasible.

Establish a Philosophical Base for Activities

Your fund raising campaign will carry both explicit and implicit messages about your program. Give careful consideration to the implicit message which, conveyed through your fund raising activities themselves, will tell the community something about yourself and your program. Consider carefully the reactions that those messages are likely to provoke. Keep in mind your community and its values, as well as the values of your agency.

Choose Targets

One of the advantages of carrying out a fund raising campaign in a rural area is the relative ease with which local targets can be identified. The information you will need to collect before selecting your targets will either be common knowledge or easily obtained through the ready network of information-sharing that exists in small towns and communities. Consider all local sources of funds, both public and private, which may be available to you. As a general starting point, consider:

1. Public agencies and their boards
2. Private agencies
3. Civic groups
4. Church groups
5. Corporations
6. Individuals
7. Foundations

Collect Information About Targets

In approaching any of the above sources for funding, you will want to have done a great deal of background work and know a great deal about your targets.

1. Understand the defined role and philosophy of the group or agency.
2. Understand their budgets.
3. Look into their history.
4. Know the current trend and demands.
5. Be aware of the timelines.
6. Understand the leadership and influence structure.

Public Relations

The material that you develop to use in a local campaign of fund raising should be appropriate to your audience, even if this means developing more than one kind of presentation letter or brochure. For that reason, the one-to-one contact remains the most effective way of selling your program. In approaching prospective donors, have a contact person, a friend or business associate make an appointment for a personal visit

by someone knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the program. Time and numbers, however, make this approach impractical for all but your largest potential givers.

Whatever method you use to carry your message to your community, there are a few solid principles to govern your campaign. First, the best public relations program is began long before a fund raising campaign. It is a continuous effort. Second, your message should be educational, stated in terms appropriate to your audience, carrying clearly to your audience who you are, what you hope to accomplish, and how much money you need to do it. It should establish your credibility, individually as a professional, and collectively, as an agency. In addition, to establish the need for services your message should cite the benefits of such services, using national research results, evaluation material from your own program, a case study, or parent testimony. Your public relations materials should describe, as specifically as possible, what you hope to accomplish. Your message should be stated in terms appropriate to each audience.

The Great Event

No exception, all of the same principles already discussed--the planning, selection of target groups, selection of personnel, supervision of volunteers, dissemination of public relations materials--apply when you carry off the great event. The more people you involve, the greater the subsequent commitment to your program, so plan events that are varied, involving a broad cross section of your community.

The opportunities for the great event are endless! They all share a certain wholesome, down-home quality which makes them family affairs, contributing to your image as an agency which cares about parents and children. They are inclusive, rather than exclusive. Although like the auction, they have the potential of being big money makers with items that may sell for hundreds, even thousands of dollars, the cost of participation need not be high. Parents and children can enjoy the fun for the cost of lemonade or a cupcake.

Evaluate the Success of Your Fund Raising Effort

Measuring results against stated goals is a process educators understand and which can be applied to our fund raising efforts. A written evaluation report provides a data base which can be used for revising approaches and for future planning. Factors you should consider are:

--amount of money raised in relation to your goal
--amount of money spent in fund raising
--staff time spent
--feedback from volunteers and participants about the efficiency and effectiveness of strategies.

Securing Funds: A State Perspective (Weil)

Being successful at receiving state funds has a great deal to do with knowing where the state funds are. This requires that a project director become familiar with the state's administrative structure. Which are the state agencies which are the most likely to support services for young handicapped children? How are these agencies organized?

Divisions? Bureaus? Who are the people who have control at these various levels? Development of a simple organizational chart with this information was recommended. It is also helpful if a project, its director and staff become known and respected in the state. Serving on state committees or councils is a way to gain visability with funding decision-makers. It was suggested that project directors volunteer to the governor's office or to heads of state agencies to serve on committees that are appropriate such as the state Developmental Disabilities Council. Also advised was reading a state paper regularly and becoming familiar with the state's economic situation, its tax policies and major issues besides services to handicapped children.

It was strongly recommended that projects diversify their funding sources. Directors should analyze the populations they are serving and seek funds for various categories of children. The manner in which the Washington County Children's Program in Maine received funds from the Maine Department of Human Services, the Department of Mental Health, and Bureau of Mental Retardation and the Department of Education was described. Funds from each state agency were targeted to somewhat different types of children. Rural programs, particularly, may serve a wide range of children because few programs exist in extremely rural locations. A project might be serving severely, moderately and mildly handicapped children; developmentally delayed children; abused and/or neglected children; and children who are "at risk" for each of these problems. Different rationales can be developed for serving each population. Proposals explaining each rationale may be appropriate for consideration by different parts of state government.

Some advantages of coordination were discussed. One of the major advantages can be the savings of money for those participating. The issues of turf and trust, as roadblocks to coordination, were acknowledged. Coordinating or sharing costs on very tangible items was suggested as a way to begin. Some of these might be office supplies, equipment, space, phone. More difficult cost sharing/coordination might include secretarial services, training activities, consultants, regular staff. Although not easy, the benefits of such coordination can be very great.

Coordination might take place with several different agencies or programs. The following were suggested: school systems, mental retardation programs, mental health programs, low income programs, Head Start, and health programs.

Private Funding Resources: A Perspective of 1980 and a Discussion of Selected Areas of Philanthropy (Moreau)

Program Description

This presentation provided participants with an understanding of the magnitude of private giving in the U.S.A. during 1980.

Information was presented regarding the sources of private funding and who the recipients of those funds are.

Specific information regarding the importance of research and getting to know your target investors prior to asking for anything was presented.

Information was presented on specific approach to be utilized in the solicitation of individuals, foundations, corporations and deferred giving situations. References regarding the above were included, as well as the role of the board of directors or advisory board and project staff.

This presentation was directed toward those who are non-professional development officers or most specifically, those who are presently involved with direct service administration and who have a need to broaden their funding bases from the private sector.

Specific Areas Addressed:

1. Magnitude of private giving in the U.S.A.
2. Who gives and who receives?
3. Individuals . . . approaches, tax incentives, etc.
4. Foundations . . . different types, current financial plight, etc., where to look and how to research.
5. Corporations . . . different forms of corporate support, approaches, how to research.
6. Deferred giving . . . living trusts . . . etc., how to go about it and importance of board participation.
7. Role of the Board of Directors & Staff . . . who does what?

Topic: Rural Service Delivery Strategies That Work: A State Perspective

Presenters: Jane Weil, Director
Washington County Children's
Program Outreach Project
P.O. Box 311
Machias, Maine 04654

Damon Lamb, Director
Project FINIS
Williams Preschool
502 North 12th Avenue
Marshalltown, Iowa 50158

Maine's Interdepartmental Coordination Model (Weil)

The origin of the interdepartmental coordination model being developed in Maine was outlined. An organization in Maine which grew informally during 1975 and 1976, the Association for Young Children with Special Needs, took on an increasingly strong advocacy role. By submitting a bill to the Maine Legislature which would require services for handicapped children starting at birth, the Legislature was required to address this issue. The importance of this legislative involvement as a learning process for the parents and professionals who have had little legislative or political experience was stressed.

The Legislature's Committee on Education, which held hearings on the proposed bill, bargained with the key supporters of the bill. The Committee promised to get a "study order" passed by the full Legislature if the bill was withdrawn. The study order would require the Commissioners of the three key state agencies to report on their current services to young handicapped children and to make recommendations to the next session of the Legislature regarding the role of the state.

The supporters of the bill agreed to this compromise because, under the circumstances, it was the best they could do at the time. Requesting a study order is often the way to effectively kill a legislative issue.

It is important that interested supporters moniter the Commissioners of the three state agencies and their response to the study order. A very useful report was developed for the next legislative session. It clearly showed the lack of services and the inequities of available services. An interdepartmental plan was proposed to coordinate the existing services for 3-5 year old handicapped children and to use new funds to fill service gaps.

In its next session the Legislature passed a bill appropriating $150,000 state dollars for three pilot sites in the state. These sites were to develop and demonstrate interdepartmental coordination in local communities.

The model was briefly described and an update on the development of this process in Maine was presented. The Legislature appropriated funds for four more sites and changed its reference to them as "pilot" sites. The seven sites are now referred to as programs and seem relatively secure. It is hoped that Maine's 3-5 year old handicapped children will eventually be served by 16-18 sites and that there will be a downward extension of the age.

Iowa's Area Education Agencies (Lamb)

Provision of special education instructional and support services in rural areas requires a delivery model which integrates and coordinates resources of local education agencies. A statewide organizational model which utilizes intermediate agencies in provision of support and instructional services to special needs children exists in Iowa. Fifteen area education agencies exist as intermediate agencies between the State Education Agency (Department of Public Instruction) and local education agencies. As intermediate units, the area agencies coordinate special education instructional and support services.

Presented during this session was a model for service delivery developed by one of Iowa's fifteen intermediate units. The model for service delivery developed by Area Education Agency #6 reflects a management by objectives approach. Special Education Division goals are identified in five areas of operation. These areas are:

1) Management system
2) Special education delivery system
3) Evaluation system
4) Personnel development, and
5) Planning and research.

All activities of the Special Education Division stem from these five over-riding goals. Division goals are developed for a two year period and are included in the State Plan submitted to the Department of Public Instruction. Objectives are developed from the goal statements on a yearly basis. Following development of division goals and objectives, departmental (e.g. psychology, social work) objectives are developed. Departmental objectives describe projected activities designed to accomplish division goals and objectives and are written in the form of discipline specific handbooks. From departmental objectives, each staff member develops individual goals and objectives. Again, individual objectives are developed to facilitate achievement of division goals and objectives.

Preparation of the special education division budget utilizes a zero-based budgeting procedure. Zero-based budgeting as an activity falls under the division goal area of management and erases the traditional budget building approach which generally adds an increment to the current budget as a means of building a new one. It requires that each department start each year at the zero level of funds. Departmental staff then develop decision units which are defined as the general goal areas of a department. Decision units include priority statements of what will happen. For each decision unit, decision packages are developed. Decision packages are defined as the collection of activities necessary to achieve expected results for each decision unit. For each decision unit, three decision packages are required. Decision packages are written at maintenance, increase, and decrease levels. Decision packages also include statements of desired results. Decision units identified by the special education division of Area Education Agency #6 include:

1) Management
2) Special education delivery system

3) Staff development
4) Evaluation, and
5) Planning/research.

The decision unit for the special education delivery system is subdivided into the following major decision units:

1) Identification
2) Assessment and verification
3) Placement and intervention, and
4) Review and follow-up.

Each department then prioritizes their decision packages in all areas. Division goals are then drawn from departmental priorities.

The service delivery model developed by Area Education Agency #6 sets forth specific procedures and guidelines at each step in the flow of services. Seventeen steps are identified in the special education child study intervention sub-system:

1. Identification
2. Level I Pre-Referral
3. Assignment of Refined Identification Team
4. Refined Identification
5. Refined Identification Conference
6. Disposition of Refined Identification
7. Indirect Services
8. Level II Referral
9. Team Evaluation
10. Verification of Needs
11. Selection of Intervention Alternatives
12. Completion and Implementation of IEP
13. Program Monitoring
14. Review Procedures
15. Re-Evaluation
16. Dismissal, and
17. Follow-up.

Topic: Recruiting Personnel For Rural Areas

Presenters: Doris Helge, Director
National Rural Project
Murray State University
Murray, Kentucky 42071

Glendon Casto, Director
Affiliated Exceptional Child Center
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84322

Strategies for Personnel Recruitment and Retention (Helge)

Personnel Recruitment and Retention - A National Problem

Problems in recruiting and retaining special education and related services staff in rural areas have been verified by two studies of the National Rural Research and Personnel Preparation Project (NRP). A 1978-79 study involving research in 19 state education agencies discerned that 94% of all participating states experienced severe difficulties recruiting and retaining personnel to serve rural handicapped children (Helge, 1981).

A 1980 NRP study involved 75 school districts and cooperatives in 17 states in an effort to compare rural service delivery systems before and after implementation of PL 94-142. Areas reported to be most problematic for rural local education agencies (LEA's) and cooperatives were recruiting and retaining professional staff. Almost two-thirds (64%) of all respondents reported recruitment problems and almost one-half (48%) reported retention problems as critical areas of difficulty (Helge, 1980).

Successful Recruitment Strategies

Effective recruitment strategies for rural areas have four main components: (1) the use of intrinsic motivators, (2) consideration of local cultural norms, (3) tapping individualized "hot buttons," and (4) selling one's district. These strategies are briefly discussed below. A complete copy of an NRP report on this subject is available upon request.

Appealing to intrinsic versus extrinsic motivations. Many recruitment efforts concentrate on extrinsic motivations such as salary level, attractive facilities, and the availability of equipment. Most appeals of that type are relatively low on Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. Although sometimes it is essential for a recruiter to address lower levels of Maslow's Hierarchy (e.g., providing housing in rural areas where housing would not otherwise be available), professional literature indicates that recruiters should primarily address different aspects of motivation such as illustrated in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1

Maslow's Need Areas	Sample Recruitment Foci
Social Needs (e.g., love, affection, and recognition)	Friendliness of small communities Potential for status available in the prospective community

Figure 1 (Cont.)

Maslow's Need Areas	Sample Recruitment Foci
Self-Esteem Needs	Flexible programming to work in one's own interest area Small enrollments facilitating individual attention to students District foci on quality education programs
Self-Actualization Needs	Administrative support for professional growth and development Peer support environments Professional growth opportunities Any special self-development opportunities available such as proximities to professional libraries or extended universities

Consideration of local cultural norms. The 1978-79 NRP study found tremendous resistance to change in rural areas (88% of all states involved in the study) and suspicion of outside interference (72% of all states involved).

Careful screening of potential staff members who are unfamiliar with rural areas and certain types of rural subcultures should occur to determine their interests, aptitudes, and personal goals and to evaluate them with regard to compatibility with those at the local area. Adept rural administrators have realized the value of balancing their established staff with residents who understand their particular subculture and with newcomers who can offer unique cultural perspectives. Some administrators have employed informal checklists when interviewing persons external to their community.

Tapping individualized "hot buttons." Interviewers interested in hiring persons not indigenous to the rural area would want to identify individualized needs and motivations of interviewees in ways consistent with Maslow's Hierarchy. An example follows regarding the "hot button" of status.

Some administrators have called institutions of higher education and requested names of the highest ranking graduates in the field in which personnel were needed. Prospective employers then called the recommended graduates, explaining their penchant for quality and why they were interested in that particular graduate.

Selling one's district. The most effective recruitment techniques will exploit all resources of rural areas to the maximum extent possible. A skillful recruiter will attempt to convert adverse circumstances into assets wherever possible before, during, and after recruitment interviews. In an interview situation, this could mean selling the challenge of working in a community in which children are predominantly of low socio-economic backgrounds (thus addressing the self-esteem or self-actualization levels of Maslow's Hierarchy).

Recruitment Resources Available at the National Level

A National Personnel Needs Data Bank was initiated in 1980 by the NRP. The NRP maintains an informal exchange for rural school districts attempting to locate qualified special education personnel and support personnel interested in working in rural and remote areas. Listings of position openings are periodically featured in special editions of the NRP national newsletters; and position listings are also maintained in the offices of NRP for persons calling regarding such positions. During 1981, the NRP also began to maintain listings of districts interested in teacher exchanges.

Factors Influencing Retention of Professional Staff in Rural Areas (Casto)

Once a person is recruited for a position in a rural area, two factors come into play that have important influence on a person's longevity in that position. Broadly stated, these factors include job-related influences and factors related to the local environment.

Influences Related to the Job

Satisfaction with defined duties. Most job-related influences can be altered. The important thing is to collect data at each local project level that pinpoints sources of job dissatisfaction. Then, remedial steps can be taken. The assessment of job satisfaction levels of employees on a formal or informal basis can lead to job-related improvements which dramatically increase job satisfaction.

Physical environment in which work is conducted. Numerous studies have reported on the effects of various facilities on worker productivity and satisfaction. Satisfaction with improved physical environment results in improvements in overall job satisfaction ratings. Many early special education programs are located in unwanted and unused facilities. An ugly or overcrowded facility can have a depressing effect on both children and staff.

Salaries and fringe benefits. Most rural personnel suffer from being overworked and underpaid. This situation persists despite the fact that surveys such as Needle, Griffin & Svendsen (1980) demonstrate the importance of salaries and fringe benefits to rural professionals. If sufficient monies do not exist to pay competitive salaries, then considering alternative service delivery strategies might be feasible, these include hiring fewer persons at a professional level at competitive salaries and hiring more paraprofessionals.

Relationships with supervisors and co-workers. Peer and supervisory support may help alleviate job stress in difficult situations and assist in retaining personnel. This help may be in the form of information to assist with unusual problems, in addition to the provision of emotional support (Daley, 1979). Supervisors and peers also provide most of the reinforcement. When that reinforcement is adequate, job satisfaction is rated higher. Supervisors allowing their employees to use their discretion concerning sick and annual leave can help alleviate job stress and help retain employees.

Reinforcement from students or clients. This relates closely to the severity of client problems. The most severely impaired clients are usually the most difficult because of their slow response to treatment. It may be frustrating to wait weeks and sometimes months for noticeable improvement. It has been suggested that this problem may be alleviated by arranging for all staff members to share the caseload and also to rotate the more difficult clients repeatedly. One of the unique problems of the rural area professional staff is that it is usually small, so efforts toward rotating clients must be carefully planned.

Availability of support services. Another job-related factor that contributes to higher retention rates is the availability of support services. Again, if rural personnel have access to direct communication with technical assistance personnel, they are less likely to feel isolated and alone. WATS line communication channels can be set up and dedicated closed-circuit television can be utilized to transmit training and technical information. Other support system services contributing to the retention of rural personnel are information dissemination systems, access to some type of technical assistance, and access to regional and national conferences.

Staff development and in-service training activities. Another job-related factor that contributes to higher retention rates is improved staff development and in-service training capability. Many times, staff members in rural settings are isolated from professionals in the field. To maintain and improve their skill levels, individual training plans should be developed for every individual in an organization. These plans should be individualized, but they may contain both individual and group training activities.

Influences Related to the Local Environment

Cultural and recreational opportunities. To the extent that a worker's cultural and recreational interests match those available in the rural environment he/she is more likely to remain in that environment. When there is a clear mismatch, some adjustment must occur or the worker is not likely to remain. Tucker (1970) has advocated that workers take an inventory of their own cultural and recreational interests, take an inventory of those available in the local culture, and then develop an individual plan of action to maximize their cultural and recreational opportunities. In some cases, substitutions can be made, i.e., water skiing for snow skiing. In other cases, trips outside may be planned to meet cultural or recreational needs.

Acceptance by members of rural communities. Many rural communities view outsiders with suspicion and mistrust. Being alienated from community life results in increased stress and reduced productivity. This alienation may occur because the community is slow to accept outsiders, or it may occur because the outsider is culturally arrogant and tends to belittle the local community. In either case, acceptance may be gained by showing genuine interest in community life and reacting positively to the community.

Acceptance of local geography and climate. Geographic and climatic differences exist in rural areas which can be taken in stride or which pose serious problems. Acceptance of such variations is part of the characteristics of those service providers who tend to remain in rural areas.

Conclusion

The cost of replacing rural professionals who leave positions after a short time has never been calculated. If such costs could be ascertained, they would be staggering. This is one of the critical factors in rural service delivery that must be foremost in our minds. When recruiting a staff, we must direct our attention to recruiting those professionals most likely to remain in rural areas and then take all possible measures to ensure their job longevity.

References

Daley, Michael R. Preventing worker burnout in child welfare. Child Welfare, July/August, 1979, LVIII, No. 7, 443-451.

Tucker, Michael. Improving cross-cultural training and measuring cross-cultural learning. Denver, Co.: Center for Research and Education, 1973.

Topic: Issues and Practices in Parent Involvement

Presenters: Dale Gentry
Chairperson
Department of Special Education
College of Education
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho 83843

Patricia L. Hutinger
Project Director
OUTREACH: Macomb 0-3 Regional Project
27 Horrabin Hall
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois 61455

David Shearer
Program Administrator
Exceptional Child Center
UMC 68
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84322

Session Overview

The session was designed to present some notions that are to be included in a Rural Network monograph related to parent participation in rural programs for young handicapped children. Presenters included content related to effective practices (Shearer), viewing parent involvement as working with adult learners (Hutinger), and the readiness of parents to become involved with an early intervention program (Gentry).

Parents' Readiness for Participation in Early Intervention Programs (Gentry)

The necessity of parental participation in early intervention for children with special needs is based on a belief that parents know their child better than anyone else and that parents are their child's primary teacher. But it is essential to consider the readiness of parents of young handicapped children to become involved in various services to their children since there are often many factors working against such involvement. Both general involvement (in an early intervention program) and specific involvement (in working on a specific task) are considered together since the latter is clearly dependent on the former.

Parent readiness to participate can be defined as 1) motivation to become involved, 2) possession of adequate prerequisite knowledge, and 3) an ability to attend. Motivation, though it may be a fuzzy concept, is an important practical consideration in working with parents of handicapped children. Here it is used to refer to behavioral indicators that parents are willing to actively participate in their children's program. Perhaps every early educator has interacted with parents who cannot yet acknowledge that their child has a handicap, let alone become involved with that child in an early intervention program. Even after parents can accept their child's handicap, they may choose for a variety of reasons not to become involved in their child's program, even at a minimal level. Motivation, viewed as an important consideration prior to initiating a learning task, leads to the concept of readiness. Motivation to attend to

and acquire new information related to educational programming can be overwhelming if parents are still enveloped by grief reactions to their child's diagnosis.

The parents' emotional state is an integral component of the factors related to readiness. Elements of the readiness factor are also impacted by characteristics of a rural community such as isolation, transportation problems, independence, and staff shortages. Finally, prerequisite knowledge which may enhance readiness can include an understanding of the importance of parent participation, assessment information, ongoing data showing child change through successful programming, and specifics describing a particular handicapping condition.

Parent readiness can be encouraged by an understanding of the varying responses a family may experience. The effective use of communication tools can assist early education staff in their task of exchanging information with families and attempting to assess readiness.

Participation options, depending upon the parents' degree of readiness, will vary, depending upon the family's needs. Assisting with transportation, circulating a newsletter, attending meetings, or organizing meetings, seeking political or financial aid for the program, assisting in the classroom (if one is available), or assisting with assessment are all examples of the numerous involvement opportunities. Parents may also be involved in conducting home programs with their child. When the program is home based, parents participate actively in the home visit. The success rate for involvement in each of these endeavors will be increased if the parent has had the time and encouragement to develop a readiness for participation.

Effective Practices in Parent Involvement (Shearer)

In the field of early childhood education for the handicapped, it has become widely accepted that we must in fact involve parents if we expect the children we serve to maintain the gains that they experience through earlier intervention. And for a session with this topic of issues and practices in parent involvement, it is good to review why we feel we need to involve parents in their child's early childhood education.

Rationale for Parent Involvement

1. The Child's First Teacher: Parents are their child's first teacher. They are the first adults to interact with the infant and they are the ones who begin to teach the child skills in the home.

2. Parents Know Their Child Best: The parents will always know what their child's best learning styles are, what the best reinforcements for them are and what their child is ready to learn better than any other person.

3. Caretaking Responsibility: Another reason for involving parents is that parents will have the responsibility for taking care of their handicapped child for a much longer period of time than parents of normal children. Therefore, it is important that they acquire skills in teaching their child.

4. Provides Functional Learning: Involvement of parents in the planning and implementation of curriculum of a preschool child and implementing that into the home insures that what the child is learning is, in fact, appropriate and functional to that child's development.

5. Minimizes Transfer of Learning Problems: Involving parents directly with the child's education minimizes the difficulty of attempting to transfer what the child has learned in the classroom back to the home where what has been learned is used in a practical environment.

6. Preventative Function: Involving parents in the child's education and providing parents with teaching skills help to insure that the parents can transfer those skills to other siblings and future siblings in the home.

7. Assess Parent/Child Interaction: Involving parents in the program provides the teacher with an opportunity to observe how the parents and child interact, which will indicate to the teacher the best approach in involving the parents with their child's education.

8. Documented Effectiveness: Parents serve as very good evaluators of program in that they can see the results on a daily basis in the home.

As we have worked with parents in the Portage Project over the years we have come up with a few helpful hints on How To Work With Parents:

1. Model for the parents; show them what to do and how to do it. Parents do not often think of themselves as teachers of their own children, and, therefore, they have not had much practice in conducting very specific educational activities and reinforcement techniques with their child. As a result, it is important not to only describe what should be done with the child, but to model for the parents.

2. Have parents practice teaching the activity in front of you. This is one step that we find to be lacking 90% of the time in those programs that have difficulty in involving parents. Parents will nod their heads yes and sincerely feel they understand what the teaching technique will be for a particular activity. Nevertheless, when asked to perform that activity it is often times discovered that they did not fully understand how to present the activity, how to reinforce the activity and/or how to record that activity.

3. Reinforce the parents. Tell them when they are teaching correctly. As stated earlier, parents do not often think of themselves as teachers of their children. Therefore, when practicing an activity in front of another adult it often times is intimidating and therefore parents seem inhibited in role playing for a teacher. Thus the parents need to be told how well they are doing, that they really did a good job with their child.

4. Individualize for parents. We, as educators, have learned over the years that all children are different and so we need to individualize our curriculum for each child. But we have often lost sight of the fact that parents are different too and therefore we need to individualize our teaching techniques with parents based on what they understand,

what their present teaching skills are and how willing they are to teach their own children.

5. Involve parents in planning goals. Parents are much more likely to initiate and continue to implement curriculum if they have had an opportunity to assist in curriculum planning.

And finally here are some Ideas for Motivating Parents:

1. Establish responsibilities at the beginning.

   a) Plan a parent orientation.
   b) Discuss and sign a written agreement.

2. Have a thorough knowledge of your program model and curriculum to assist you in conveying confidence and enthusiasm.

3. Educate parents concerning your need for their participation.
   - They know their child best.
   - They have taught the child all he/she already knows.
   - They can teach without the home teacher, but the home teacher cannot teach without them.
   - Emphasize the importance of classroom/home follow through.

4. Show confidence in your parents. Help them believe in themselves as teachers.

5. Utilize the parents' skills, talents and interests. Ask parents additional ways in which they would like to particirate.

6. Start slowly; parents don't view themselves as teachers.
   - Use activities on which the parents want to work.
   - Reinforce parents for the teaching they do well.
   - Plan activities with which the parents and child can be successful, particularly during the first week.
   - Model all activities for parents and then let the parents model them back.

7. Get an involved parent interacting with an inactive parent.

8. Promote socialization among parents as a reward for participation.

9. Give special recognition to active parents.

Parents As Adult Learners (Hutinger)

Planning for effective parent involvement can be enhanced by viewing the parent as an adult learner, a conceptual approach used by those in continuing education. Service delivery staff are so accustomed to planning programs for children that they sometimes use similar approaches for working with parents. Techniques that are effective with very young handicapped children are seldom appropriate for adults. Service personnel who are adept in identifying and programming for developmental differences in young children frequently have not been trained to work with developmental differences in adults.

Application of theoretical approaches used in continuing education related to adult learners leads to a perspective on parent involvement that is somewhat different from the usual activities used by various successful programs. Viewing parents as adult learners provides a framework to use in decision-making for both planning and carrying out a variety of procedures to implement parents' participation in their children's programs.

The adult comes into an educational program, says Knowles (1978), largely because he or she is experiencing some inadequacy in coping with current life problems. It is likely that this is the situation the parents of the handicapped child experience during and after the time they make the decision to participate in an early intervention program. Knowles says of the adult learner, "He wants to apply tomorrow what he learns today, so his time perspective is one of immediacy of application." (1978, p.58). Surely this describes the needs of many parents of handicapped children.

Knowles points out that use of a problem orientation has important implications related to organization of curricula and learning experiences for adult learners. If this is true, then a relevant curriculum for parents must be organized around the problem areas that the adults themselves see as problems.

Another of Knowles' assumptions is that as a person grows and matures his/her self-concept moves from one of total dependency (in infancy) to increasing self-directedness. Maintaining that the point at which the individual achieves a self-concept of essential self-direction is the point where an individual psychologically becomes an adult, Knowles notes a critical juncture. At this point, the individual develops a deep psychological need to be perceived by others as being self-directed. When the parent finds him/herself in a situation where he/she is not allowed to be self-directing, the adult experiences tension between the situation and his/her self-concept.

The reservoir of experience accumulated by the adult (parent) is at the same time a rich resource for learning and a broad base upon which to relate new learning. If parent involvement is to be successful, there should be decreasing emphasis on traditional teaching transmittal techniques and increasing emphasis on experiental techniques which "tap the experience of the learners and involve them in analyzing their experience, " (Knowles, 1978, p.56). Application of this assumption to practice in parent involvement would suggest that the use of lectures, canned audio-visual presentations and assigned reading are much less appropriate than discussion, hands-on experience, simulation, field experience, and other action-learning techniques.

Knowles outlines a set of characteristics of learning which have been adopted for parent involvement experiences by changing the word "learners" to "parents". The list follows:

1. Parents feel a need to learn.
2. The learning environment is characterized by physical comfort, mutual respect and trust, mutual helpfulness, freedom of expression, and acceptance of differences.
3. Parents perceive the goals of the learning experience to be their goals.
4. Parents accept a share of the responsibility for planning and operating a learning experience, so they then have a feeling of commitment toward it.

5. Parents participate actively in the learning process.
6. The learning process is related to an makes use of the experience of the learners.
7. Parents have a sense of progress toward their goals.

(Knowles, 1978, pp.78, 79)

REFERENCE

Knowles, Malcolm. Adult learner: A neglected species. Houston: Gulf Publishing, 1978.

Topic: Interagency Coordination: Small Group Discussion

Presenters: Steve Threet
College of Human Development and Learning
Department of Special Education
Murray State University
Murray, Kentucky 42071

Mary Morse
MICE Project
RFD #4, Box 90
Concord, NH 03301

Marilyn Johnson, Director
Parent Involvement Program
United Cerebral Palsy Assn. of New York
Southern Tier Division
231 Roberts Building
Jamestown, New York 14701

This session entailed a small group discussion centered on interagency coordination at the local level. The format was a problem solving one in which mutual problems were listed and group solutions were shared. Mary Morse, MICE Project, Concord, New Hampshire; Marilyn Johnson, Parent Involvement Program, Jamestown, New York; and Steve Threet, Murray State University, Murray, Kentucky facilitated the session, providing successful coordinating strategies that had been utilized by their projects. Problems discussed included turf guarding, communication breakdowns, legal restraints, and program overlap.

Topic: Rural Transportation: A Problem Solving Session

Moderator: Jamie Tucker
Resources Developer
Region VI Resources Access Project
1209 West 12th
Austin, Texas 78703

Transportation continues to be a major problem for professionals involved in service delivery to handicapped children in rural areas of America. Realities such as long distances, isolated families, inadequate funding, scarcity of services, and problems with service delivery vehicles have forced rural service providers to seek other means of reaching rural families. This small group problem-solving session addressed three approaches that offer possibilities for dealing with the transportation situation.

Jimmye Gowling, from Project: SEARCH, Silsbee, Texas, discussed the use of a mobile van in service delivery to handicapped children in Silsbee. Project: SEARCH has experienced a great deal of success in utilizing a mobile van and Ms. Gowling shared practical information concerning acquisition, problems, successes, cost, upkeep, and other data relative to use of the van.

Marilyn Johnson, from the Parent Involvement Program, Jamestown, New York, offered an innovative strategy for securing funds. Her program is experimenting with the idea of petitioning Family Court for transportation money. Ms. Johnson also shared some concerns relative to additional insurance for staff who must transport families.

The S-E-Kan Project in Parsons, Kansas has been successful in leasing cars for rural staff to drive. Ms. Lee Snyder-McClean shared strategies involved in this approach which relieves the service provider of having to use his/her personal car to reach families.

Following a brief presentation by each participant, the audience engaged in a sharing discussion and question period regarding problems and possible solutions to transportation problems. Although no definitive solutions were reached. participants in the small group problem solving session were stimulated to tackle their transportation problems again. Many left with the feeling that, although the problems are complex and difficult, other projects are facing them, too, and that by sharing ideas, success, and failures, solutions can be found.

Topic: Networks: Building on the Rural Self-Help Tradition

Presenter: Stephen R. Wilson
Network Coordinator
Rural Coalition
Washington, D.C.

The problems confronted when delivering educational services to rural handicapped children are common to the delivery of any human services program in rural communities: lack of political and institutional sensitivity, difficulties in recruitment and retention of technical professionals, inadequate densities of needy populations and insufficient financial bases for payment of services tied to increased costs for facilities and transportation. Public awareness and readiness to react and act on any particular issue are mitigated against by the absence of communication systems and the overwhelming dilemma of rural life.

All of these problems are now exacerbated by the threatened and real reduction in federal support for human services, and the discussions of decreased vigilence and regulation that we have established to protect special populations like handicapped children.

HCEEP and all rural advocate and support organizations have the trifold challenge of increasing impact with decreasing resources; utilizing political persuasion while maintaining professional leadership; and sustaining community support while their very actions are likely to expand the demands of rural communities for their services.

To be most effective, a network has to be both well-defined and flexible. Rural networks must always have a local, regional, state and national presence in order to be most effective. This is not easily accomplished. Many long-established organizations that have built their networks from bottom up to top down now realize tremendous resources required, and the sometimes questionable effectiveness of their single issue initiatives.

These groups now see the benefit of becoming a coalition on fundamental values for improved lifestyles for rural communities. Some organizations serve only the poor or only farmers, or only use their efforts to increase adequate health care. But with a shared agenda and joint actions, much more can be accomplished for each of the special populations of concern.

My strongest recommendation is that while you work to overcome professional bias, disproportionate allocation of resources, institutional jealousy and turf-dispute within your own discipline, you also look for other rural allies.

Other rural groups, and national organizations that represent chiefly rural areas, or in some part speak to rural concerns, need to hear your voice. In this way the work of HCEEP is placed on the agenda of other networks as well. The progression is geometric, and the tactical exchange

that occurs between representative community organizers and other leaders is essential to creative and effective solutions to our long-term problems.

More specifically, now that the distribution of resources is shifted down from the federal to state level, increased scrutiny of state allocations is critical. Within your state organizations, you may wish to coalesce with other human service organizations and form a monitoring and advocacy committee. The size of any one special population may not be politically impactful. But when joined by a statewide organization, that population's needs are more likely to be addressed by the state legislature and governor's office.

Efforts such as new coalitions require additional personal and financial expenditures from organizations with limited resources. Recent events, more than any time before, would indicate that no institution, particularly government, can be relied on to meet the needs of rural people. Therefore, the responsibility for progressive change lies within the community and the individuals concerned. We should re-evaluate the important uses of public information and the promotion of volunteerism and how these campaigns served in the struggle for public accommodations, women's and Black suffrage, and the existing policies for handicapped education.

Returning to these techniques, refining them in ways that are appealing to a broad cross-section of people is the key to the establishment of a network that meets the three challenges I mentioned earlier.

Volunteers, linked with professionals based in rural areas, can provide a link with the public at-large, and access local resources for promotion and education. We have done a poor job of marketing the benefits of human service programs. The concern and responsiveness of the public has been taken for granted. The results of our inattention helped support the swing in public consciousness reflected in the support for the new Administration's policies.

HCEEP's proposed state and sub-state chapters can be ably augmented by action committees and individual volunteers made up of parents of handicapped children, retirees and other interested citizens.

Workshopping, and public information campaigns with these volunteers and HCEEP members can result in: increased media coverage of beneficial programs; positive change in institutional and political sensitivity; monitoring; and making an impact on resource allocations by state and local agencies. Further, with such campaigns you derive an analysis of public interest and involve other groups and organizations interested in rural human service delivery.

It is expensive and difficult to obtain trainers and to conduct large meetings, but this is not necessary for the implementation of my recommendations. Linkage with other established advocacy organizations provides a deep well of experienced people who are capable in every area of volunteerism and public information. Locally, progressive media personalities, schools of journalism and communication can be tapped for expertise in the development of information programs.

Each training initiative should be focused on "how to" rather than "what is" in order that time is most efficiently utilized, and participants leave with strategies that can be implemented, and tied to the overall initiative of HCEEP or the coalition efforts of the network.

It is my belief that building on such foundations is the longest and hardest route, but it is the most successful and long-term approach to the promotion of social change and the provision of needed services for all handicapped children.

Additionally, and most importantly, such organization provides the only real clout remaining to special interest organizations. An identifiable constituency that can be mobilized is the fuel that powers the political system. With a return to state control, local officials, state legislators and governors become equally, if not more, attentive to your area or specialized population, than federal officials elected from your area have been. It is with an organized constituency that you can make an important impact on such political systems.

Lastly, it is most important to dig deep to support your own and other human service organizations. If you are employed in a social service field, or your agency receives funds that are allocated to or protected by a network such as HCEEP, it should be able to contribute 1% of salaries or budget to such efforts. Some thought should be given to whether the remaining 99% would be available or will remain available without the efforts of HCEEP and other organizations.

HCEEP RURAL WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Evaluation Report

HCEEP Rural Network
Second Annual Workshop

Sheraton Century Center
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
June 10-12, 1981

Upon the conclusion of the Second Annual Rural Workshop, participants were requested to complete an evaluation questionnaire. Fifty-five individuals from 21 states representing 45 different agencies, governmental offices or special projects attended the workshop. Thirty-three of the workshop's 55 participants completed the questionnaire. (See Appendix A). Respondents described their overall satisfaction with the meeting and rated the extent to which each workshop purpose was met. Sessions were evaluated in terms of quality and usefulness. Open-ended questions assessed the strengths and weaknesses of the meeting, interest in future rural workshops and interest in the development of regional networks. Additional comments concerning the value of the meeting, and comments on the location, organization and accommodations were elicited. Respondents were also asked to indicate their professional affiliation. Table 1 reflects this breakdown.

TABLE 1

Professional Affiliation	N
HCEEP Demonstration Project (East)	4
HCEEP Demonstration Project (West)	6
HCEEP Outreach Project (East)	2
HCEEP Outreach Project (West)	6
SIG	4
TA/OSE	1
Former HCEEP Project	2
Other (please specify)	2
Individuals who specified their professional affiliation were:	
University Instructor	1
Private consultant	2
Educational cooperative	2
Regional laboratory	1
Total	33

Overall Satisfaction: Participants rated their overall satisfaction with the workshop on a 7-point scale, with 7 as the highest rating. The mean, based on 33 responses, was 5.86. This positive rating indicates that the workshop provided a very satisfactory experience for the participants.

Purposes of Workshop Achieved. Participant responses suggest that all workshop purposes were well achieved (See Table 2). The workshop's purpose "to encourage both mutual development of solutions to common problems and the building of regional networks" received the most positive rating.

Table 2

Workshop Purpose	N	Mean
A. To provide a forum for communication among rural projects.	33	6.36
B. To allow projects to share successful practices.	33	5.92
C. To encourage both mutual development of solutions to common problems and the building of regional networks.	33	6.12
D. To strengthen the HCEEP rural network and to encourage the development of regional networks.	33	6.40

NOTE: Ratings on a 7-point scale, with 7 being the most positive.

Quality and Usefulness of Sessions. Sessions addressing 16 topics of interest were rated for their quality and usefulness. As can be seen in Table 3, participants gave the majority of presentations positive ratings. The means for both quality and usefulness of 11 sessions were above 5.0 on a 7-point scale. "Staff Training for Rural Personnel", "Securing Funds" and the closing speaker received particularly high ratings in both areas. In general, the ratings imply that the sessions were well presented and that their content was appropriate in terms of its usefulness and applicability for participants.

TABLE 3

	SESSION	QUALITY		USEFULNESS	
		N	MEAN	N	MEAN
1.	Opening Speaker	20	5.5	18	5.66
2.	Keynote Speaker	30	5.03	27	4.85
3.	Transition into Public Schools	13	5.84	12	5.75
4.	Interagency Coordination: State Success Stories	8	5.5	8	5.5
5.	Affecting Rural, State and Federal Policy	NO DATA AVAILABLE			
6.	Rural Service Delivery Strategies That Work: Innovative Models	12	5.25	12	4.91
7.	Staff Training for Rural Personnel	5	6.4	5	6.2
8.	Securing Funds (3-Hour Workshop)	9	6.22	7	6.42
9.	Rural Service Delivery Strategies That Work: A State Perspective	3	5.33	2	6
10.	Recruiting Personnel for Rural Areas	8	6.25	8	6.12
11.	Parent Involvement	6	5.83	6	6
12.	Interagency Coordination: Discussion Group	6	5.83	5	5
13.	Rural Transportation: Problem Solving Session	6	5.66	3	4.33
14.	Networks Networks: Building on the Rural Self-help Tradition	24	3.79	23	3.95
15.	Building Regional Networks: Regional Workshops	26	5.57	24	5.91
16.	Closing Speaker	22	6.5	21	6.47

NOTE: Ratings on a 7-point scale, with 7 being the most positive

OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS

Narrative and quantitative responses were solicited for 10 questions. Those responses are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Question 1. What was the most positive part of the workshop for you?

- Meeting and interacting with other professionals involved in rural service delivery (9 participants provided this or a similar response).
- The closing speaker (5 participants provided this response).
- Information on service delivery models, interagency coordination (2 participants provided this response).
- The regional network meeting (3 participants provided this response).
- Conference planning and scheduling.
- The individual conference time I requested and received.
- The interest I saw being developed in incorporating other agencies besides HCEEP Projects in the preschool rural cause.
- The most useful aspect of this workshop was the atmosphere of mutual interest and support, the exchange of ideas both between individuals and in groups, and the mutual understanding of issues.

Question 2. In future HCEEP rural consortium meetings and activities, what topics and issues do you believe should be addressed?

Comments to this question were as follows:

- Continue to stress legislative involvement on public awareness as well as cooperation with schools and other agencies serving rural handicapped.
- Expand the definition of inter-agency coordination.
- Include information on fund raising, especially for private, non-profit agencies, provide more information on funding from corporations.
- Expand the network into agencies and programs outside of HCEEP network and public schools.
- Incorporate and/or expand the network to include minority/ethnic group representation.
- Continue with the development of interagency models and information on how to set them up.
- Concentrate on Personnel Preparation.

- Topics and issues should remain the same - but a higher level of expertise might make the workshop of this type more useful.

- Each meeting should include a session on the latest issues or changes, etc. which appear to be coming out of Washington, D.C.

- Information/ideas about how the network can work cooperatively and interface with other service system groups; how this can benefit both actual practices at the local level and policies at the state and federal level and, then develop a mechanism for implementation.

- Information regarding research methodology and program evaluation that is appropriate for rural service delivery.

- More "workshops", not presentations, on individual programs which are not very useful to other projects.

- Information on family treatment modes and about working with rural families with varying problems - low-economic households, handicapped parents, home programs, scheduling problems, etc.

- The network should maintain and expand directions presently underway.

- The sessions I attended dealt primarily with administrative and political issues or with dissemination (outreach) procedures. While these are all important, I would like to have seen a better balance of sessions which focus on the actual services delivered in rural areas, e.g. program organization, curricula, etc. and on the maintenance of quality programs in terms of content of staff training etc.

- One specific topic of concern to us is that of infant services in truly rural -- i.e., remote areas. Specifically, so much of an infant service program is usually built around medical care and services. However, the nearest neonatal unit in our area is a 2½ hour drive. How are other rural programs dealing with this problem?

- Broadening educational focus to include medical/social services perspective as they apply to rural service delivery.

- Administrative support for programs.

- Utilize parents as speakers.

Question 3. Do you feel this workshop was worth the time and effort you invested?

Twenty-nine respondents indicated that the workshop was worth the time and effort invested; two individuals responded negatively. A few respondents provided narrative comments which included positive statements about the quality of sessions, usefulness of information and the small size of the workshop. One respondent suggested that more time should have been alloted for "brain storming" among participants. An additional criticism was that session titles lacked specificity.

Question 4. Please indicate your overall satisfaction with this workshop.

EXTREMELY SATISFIED			Satisfied			Not at All Satisfied
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

As previously mentioned in this report, 52 respondents answered this question. The mean response was 5.86 on the 7 point scale.

Question 5. In your opinion, what was the weakest component for (or aspect) of this workshop?

A variety of responses were received and are listed below:

- Not knowing what the program agenda was until registration and not knowing about the continental breakfast.
- Not enough people, especially new (or less experienced project people), largely because of what such people could have gained from the conference.
- There wasn't enough time to pursue in depth the topics of interest.
- Getting behind schedule on occasion.
- The speaker at the closing luncheon.
- When talking about their own projects, speakers need to describe process and aspects which can be used elsewhere. "Show & Tell" about a specific project serving a specific group is interesting - but those from other parts of the country need to know things which they can use.
- Keynote and opening speaker.
- Rural emphasis sometimes lost in individual sessions, e.g. parent involvement.

Question 6. If you requested an individual consultation, was time allotted for it?

During the course of the workshop, participants were given an opportunity for individual consultations by request. Four participants indicated that they requested and received an individual consultation. All four stated that their individual consultation was helpful.

Question 7. Did the workshop serve to increase your interest in Rural Network?

Twenty-seven respondents chose to answer this question positively while two respondents indicated that the workshop did not increase their interest as their interest was high prior to the workshop. Comments to this question were as follows:

- It's nice to know that I'll have some place to turn for help as my project spreads to rural target areas.
- I'm new, so it "sparked" my interest. I now know that I'm not struggling alone and that my state is not struggling alone.

- Frequently I feel that few people are concerned with or interested in rural education. It is exciting to find other able professionals who choose to live and work in rural areas.

- I want to find out more about it.

- It increased my awareness and helped me to specify goals.

- I still feel the need for further clarification of purposes for Rural Network.

- I feel more comfortable about my understanding of the Rural Network's goals.

- I was not previously involved and now plan on it.

Question 8. Did the workshop serve to increase your interest in building a regional network in your particular geographical location?

Of the 29 responses received for this question, 26 indicated that the workshop did indeed increase their interest in building a regional network whereas 2 respondents said that it did not. One respondent was uncertain. Comments were as follows:

- I've included it in the dissemination plans of my project.

- I'm uncertain because of the many variables involved.

- If a core of "presenters" traveled around to regions, it would be less expensive. Also, this might open opportunities for development of regional talent.

- I have some feeling that we'd do better if we network on the basis of demographic variables such as economy, density of population and remoteness - rather than geographic location. With modern technology of travel and communication, physical distance seems the easiest to overcome.

- We already have a very good network within the state and in our particular area it would be a mistake to regionalize further. I feel this workshop should be kept at the national level at this time and move to facilitate cooperation of agencies within each state.

- Yes, travel, money, uniqueness of geographical areas.

Question 9. Do you think a series of regional rural workshops may be more useful than a national rural workshop?

Seventeen participants felt that a series of regional rural workshops might be more useful than a national rural workshop. Six respondents stated a preference for a national workshop and 3 individuals were undecided. Comments were as follows:

- If you can get enough people together.

- National workshop is still small enough in numbers to allow individual discussion yet the broad - based program presented is more stimulating and provocative than what a regional workshop might offer.

- It would reduce travel distances (we're rural remember?). Involving more people in presenting from a region would make it more personal and would enhance the building bridges idea. We would also be able to bring in more than one representative from different agencies and broaden our base to include minority groups.

- Keep national workshop going annually, also.

- If the regional populations are tapped for awareness and expertise it would be successful.

- Yes and no - difficult to say since topics of importance may not be identical to each state in the various regions.

- We need both with somwhat different purposes.

- I'm not sure if regional should replace national. A regional workshop can have a deeper impact on implementing ideas, availability of quick and accessable support, etc. A national workshop has the advantage of larger exposure to other issues, larger group support and allows for planning for national issues, etc.

- Regional workshop would help to meet the constraints of travel.

- Yes, travel, money, uniqueness of geographical areas.

- Possibly, maybe a survey could be done early in the fall to get a "feel" for how many might come. We can probably all provide appropriate mailing lists.

Question 10. List any comments you would like to make concerning the workshop location, organization, time of meetings, accommodations, etc.

- Exceptionally well-organized workshop - very pleasant surrounds. As a newcomer, I appreciated the openess and hospitality of all the participants. Thanks.

- Marvelous hospitality and accommodations. Congrats to the local arrangements people (and to the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce.)!

- Excellent!

- Could the network avoid conferences being held in the ERA ratified states?

- Holding the workshop earlier in the year would have been more helpful.

- Good selection & planning for convention!

- Great accommodations and organization.

- Ok but expensive

- I appreciate all of the time and efforts which went into making this conference a success.

- Conference was small but those who came were commited and had valuable information to share.

- Well done in all respects.

- I wonder if more people could have come if it had been further east - but location in terms of hotel/activities was excellent.

- May want to consider that some people cannot come if we don't at least make interpreter services available.

- Well organized. Outside speakers not dynamic but gave us some good perspectives.

SUMMARY

It is evident from the analysis of both quantitative data and written comments that the Second Annual HCEEP Rural Network workshop was successful in promoting communication among individuals working with young, handicapped children in rural areas. Workshop evaluation results also attest to its effectiveness in stimulating interest in the development of regional networks.

Prepared by David Gilderman
WESTAR

APPENDIX A: RURAL WORKSHOP AGENDA

HCEEP RURAL NETWORK

SECOND RURAL WORKSHOP

Sheraton Century Center
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

June 10-12, 1981

AGENDA

June 10, Wednesday

5:00 PM - 8:00 PM	Registration
	Opening Speaker: Barbara Zang, State Network Coordinator, Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C. "Affecting State and Federal Policy"
	Cocktail Reception and Regional Social Hour

June 11, Thursday

8:00 AM - 8:30 AM	Late Registration
8:30 AM	Welcome and Network Update: Harris Gabel, Chairman
	Keynote Speaker: Everett Eddington, Director, ERIC-CRESS "Effective Change in Rural Schools and Communities"
10:00 AM	BREAK
10:30 AM	Concurrent Sessions:
	Transition into Public Schools: Workshop Patti Hutinger, Coordinator, Macomb, Illinois Wanda Black, Macomb, Illinois Marilyn Frank, Morgantown, West Virginia
	Interagency Coordination: State Success Stories Chris Bartlett, Maine Sharyl Gottschalk, South Dakota
	Affecting Rural State and Federal Policy: Discussion Group Barbara Zang, Washington, D.C.
12:00 Noon	LUNCH (On Your Own)
1:30 PM	Concurrent Sessions:
	Rural Service Delivery Strategies That Work: Innovative Models Jimmye Gowling, Silsbee, Texas Jim Pezzino, Missoula, Montana
	Staff Training for Rural Personnel Joyce Evans, Austin, Texas Diane Garner, Lubbock, Texas

June 11, Thursday

1:30 PM — Concurrent Sessions (Continued):

Securing Funds - Three Hour Workshop
Sharon Kiefer, Coordinator, Lightfoot, Virginia
Part 1. Corinne Garland, Houston, Texas
Jane Weil, Machias, Maine
Part 2. Arthur Moreau, Peoria, Illinois

3:00 PM — BREAK

3:30 PM — Concurrent Sessions:

Securing Funds (Continued)

Rural Service Delivery Strategies That Work: A State Perspective
Jane Weil, Machias, Maine
Damon Lamb, Marshalltown, Iowa

Recruiting Personnel for Rural Areas
Doris Helge, Murray, Kentucky
Glen Casto, Logan, Utah

Issues and Practices in Parent Involvement
Dale Gentry, Coordinator, Moscow, Idaho
Patti Hutinger, Macomb, Illinois

June 12, Friday

8:00 AM — Concurrent Sessions:

Interagency Coordination: Small Group Discussion
Steve Threet, Coordinator, Murray, Kentucky
Jamie Tucker, Lubbock, Texas
Mary Morse, Concord, New Hampshire
Marilyn Johnson, Jamestown, New York

Rural Transportation: A Problem Solving Session
Jamie Tucker, Moderator, Lubbock, Texas

9:00 AM — Networks: Building on the Rural Self-Help Tradition
Steven Wilson, Network Developer, Rural Coalition, Washington, D.C.

10:15 AM — BREAK

10:45 AM — Workshops by Regions: Building Regional Networks

12:00 Noon — LUNCH - Closing Speaker: Hon. Wes Watkins (D. Oklahoma)
Chairman, Congressional Rural Caucus

APPENDIX B: LIST OF RURAL WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

The previous numbered page in the original document was blank

Participants: 2nd Rural Workshop

Chris Bartlett
Division of Special Education
Dept. of Educ. & Cultural Services
Augusta, Maine 04333
(207) 289-3451

Talbot Black
TADS
500 NCNB Plaza
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
(919) 967-9221

Wanda Black
West Central Ill. Special
Education Cooperative
323 W. Washington
Macomb, Illinois 61455
(309) 837-3911

Deborah Brown
Early Childhood Project
188 South St.
Pittsfield, Mass. 01201
(413) 499-0745

Glen Casto
Multi-Agency Project
for Preschoolers
P.O. Box 641
Logan, Utah 84321
(801) 750-2000

Joan Clary
State Department of Public Instruction
Grimes State Office Bldg., 3rd Floor
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
(515) 281-3176

Bonnie Smith-Dickson
Outreach: Macomb 0-3 Regional Project
27 Horrabin Hall
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois 61455
(309) 298-1634

Everett Eddington
ERIC-CRESS
New Mexico State University
Las Crusas, New Mexico 88003

Joyce Evans
Southwest Education Development Lab
211 East 7th St.
Austin, Texas 78701

Pam Frakes
Early Lifestyle Program
King's Daughters' School
412 W. 9th St.
Columbia, Tennessee 38401
(615) 388-7811

Marilyn R. Frank
Project C.H.A.R.T.
West Virginia University
311 Oglebay Hall
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506
(304) 293-3303

Mary Fredericks
6704 Beth Court
Garland, Texas

Harris Gabel, Chairman
OUTFIT Project
Box 151 Peabody College
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
(615) 327-8236

Corinne Garland, Coordinator
HCEEP Rural Network
731 Wax Myrtle
Houston, Texas 77079
(713) 461-3200

Dale Gentry
Department of Special Education
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho 83843
(208) 885-6150

Sharyl Gottschalk
Section for Special Education
New State Office Building
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Jimmye Gowling
Project Search
415 West Avenue N.
Silsbee, Texas 77656
(713) 385-5286

Doris Helge, Director
National Rural Project
Center for Innovation & Development
Murray State University
Murray, Kentucky 42071
(502) 762-3817

Patricia Hutinger, Director
Outreach: Macomb 0-3 Regional Project
27 Horrabin Hall
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois 61455
(309) 298-1634

Marilyn M. Johnson
Parent Involvement Program for Infants
231 Roberts Building
Jamestown, New York 14701
(716) 483-0214

Bob Kibler
OUTFIT Project
Box 151 Peabody College
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
(615) 327-8236

Sharon E. Kiefer
Child Development Resources
Outreach Project
Box 299
Lightfoot, Virginia 23090
(804) 565-0303

Barbara Kniest
Child Development Resources
Box 299
Lightfoot, Virginia 23090
(804) 565-0303

Glenna Kyker
Rural Education Diagnosticians
Box 3AC
Las Crusas, New Mexico 88003
(505) 646-1101

Damon L. Lamb
Project FINIS
306 S. 17th Avenue
Marshalltown, Iowa 50158
(515) 752-0013

Lee K. McLean
Parsons Research Center
Chanute, Kansas 66720
(316) 421-6850

Tracey McMillan
LATON/Family Link
P.O. Box 4170
Lubbock, Texas 79409
(806) 742-3695

Steve Mishlove
Arizona State Implementation Grant
Arizona Department of Education
1535 W. Jefferson St.
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
(602) 255-3183

Art Moreau
CEPA
Division of Innovation & Development
Box 5-Z
Peoria, Illinois 61650

Mary Morse
MICE Project
RFD #4, Box 90
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
(603) 485-7674

Jim Pezzino
Big Sky Early Education Center
University of Montana
Missoula, Montana 59812
(406) 243-5467

Dick Rundall
Project RHISE/Outreach
650 N. Main St.
Rockford, Illinois 61103
(815) 965-6766

Sue Schafer
Child Success Project
Box 22487, TWU Station
Denton, Texas 76204
(817) 387-6063

Steven Smith
Project RHISE/Outreach
650 N. Main St.
Rockford, Illinois 61103
(815) 965-6766

Regina Swearengen
LATON
College of Home Economics
P.O. Box 4170
Lubbock, Texas 79409
(806) 742-3295

Stephen W. Threet
Early Lifestyle Program Demo. Project
Murray State University
Murray, Kentucky 42071
(615)762-2447

Jamie Tucker
Resources Developer
Region VI Resources Access Project
1209 West 12th
Austin, Texas 78703
(806) 742-3148

Kay P. Walker
Project Sunrise Outreach
Eastern Montana College
Billings, Montana 59101
(406) 657-2250

The Honorable Wes Watkins (D. Okla.)
Congressional Rural Caucus
Cannon Building, Rm. 137
Washington, D.C. 20510

Jane Weil
Washington County Children's Program
Outreach Project
P.O. Box 311
Machias, Maine 04654
(406) 657-2250

Steven Wilson
Network Developer, Rural Coalition
1035 30th St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Nancy G. Yonkee
Project SUNRISE Outreach
Eastern Montana College
Billings, Montana 59101
(406) 657-2250

Gene Ann Young
Brescia College Outreach Project
120 W. 7th St.
Owensboro, Kentucky 42301

Barbara Zang
Children's Defense Fund
1520 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 483-1470

Sara Sack
S-E-KAN
Parsons Research Center
Parsons, Kansas 67357
(316) 421-6850

Barbara Sobmorson
S-E-KAN
Parsons Research Center
Parsons, Kansas 67357
(316) 421-6850

Mike Woodard
TADS
500 NCNB Plaza
Chapel Hill, North Carolina
(919) 962-2001

David Shearer
Exceptional Child Center
UMC 68
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84322
(801) 750-1981

Louise Phillips
1510 Terrace
Magnolia, Arkansas 71753

Phyllis Ellis
420 S.E. 26th Terrace
Topeka, Kansas 66605 (913) 296-3866

Ramona Patterson
33 Patrician Shores
Meredith, NH 03253 (603) 279-8943

Denese Pillam
7712 B Albany
Lubbock, Texas 79401

Penny Payne
P.O. Box 1999
Thomasville, GA 31792

Jerri Patterson
P.O. Box 1999
Thomasville, GA 31792

Jim Fluegel, Director
5 County Educational Coop
P.O. Box 298
McAlester, OK 74501 (918) 426-1242

Kaye Theimer, Project Director, CIEEP
Sandy Pedersen
Pam Grannis
Rhonda Malloy
Carol Clingan, Project Coordinator
600 S. College
Tulsa, OK 74104 (918) 592-6000

Jo Ann Gordoni
3100 Classen
Norman, OK 73071
(405) 521-2312 Office

APPENDIX C: RURAL WORKSHOP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

HCEEP Rural Network

Second Annual Workshop

Sheraton Century Center

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

June 10-12, 1981

This questionnaire is designed to gather your opinions concerning the quality and usefulness of this workshop. We will use the information you provide to determine the effectiveness of this meeting and to improve future meetings of this kind. We appreciate your most honest and objective opinions. THANK YOU.

Please indicate your professional affiliation:

HCEEP Demonstration Project (East)	_____	SIG	_____
HCEEP Demonstration Project (West)	_____	TA/DSE Staff	_____
HCEEP Outreach Project (East)	_____	Former HCEEP Project	_____
HCEEP Outreach Project (West)	_____	Other(please specify)	_____

I. To what extent did you perceive the workshop to have achieved its purposes? (Please circle the appropriate response for each item.)

	Very Well				Adequately		Not at All
A. To provide a forum for communication among rural projects.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
B. To allow projects to share successful practices.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
C. To encourage both mutual development of solutions to common problems and the building of regional networks.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
D. To strengthen the HCEEP rural network and to encourage the development of regional networks.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

II. The workshop agenda was structured so that participants could choose among several topics of high interest to rural HCEEP projects. Please rate sessions that you attended in terms of both quality and usefulness.

Session Title	Quality							Usefulness						
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 1981	Excellent			Avg.		Poor		Very Useful			Of Some Use		Not Useful	
Opening speaker	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1981														
Keynote speaker	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Transition into Public Schools	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Interagency Coordination: State Success Stories	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Affecting Rural State and Federal Policy	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Rural Service Delivery Strategies That Work: Innovative Models	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Staff Training for Rural Personnel	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Securing Funds (3-Hour Workshop)	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Rural Service Delivery Strategies That Work: A State Perspective	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Recruiting Personnel for Rural Areas	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
FRIDAY, JUNE 12, 1981														
Interagency Coordination: Discussion Group	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Rural Transportation: Problem Solving Session	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Networks: Building on the Rural Self-help Tradition	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Building Regional Networks: Regional Workshops	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Closing Speaker	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

We are very interested in your feedback. Please list any comments you wish to make on individual sessions. (Use back of form if needed).

Session Title:

COMMENTS:

Session Title:

COMMENTS:

III. Please respond to each of the following questions. Your answers will be carefully reviewed and considered.

1. What was the most positive part of the workshop for you? Please explain.

2. In future HCEEP rural network meetings and activities, what topics and issues do you believe should be addressed?

3. Do you feel this workshop was worth the time and effort you invested?
Yes_____ No _____
Comments:

4. Please indicate your overall satisfaction with this workshop. (Please circle appropriate response.)

Extremely Satisfied		Satisfied				Not at All Satisfied
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

5. In your opinion, what was the weakest component (or aspect) of this workshop?

6. If you requested an individual consultation, was time allotted for it?
Yes _____ No _____ Did not request _____

If yes, was it helpful? Yes _____ No _____
Please explain.

7. Did the workshop serve to increase your interest in the Rural Network?
Yes _____ No _____ Please explain.

8. Did the workshop serve to increase your interest in building a regional network in your particular geographical location?
Yes _____ No _____
If yes, please briefly describe your plans.

9. Do you think a series of regional rural workshops may be more useful than a national rural workshop?
Yes _____ NO _____ Please explain.

10. List any comments you would like to make concerning the workshop location, organization, time of meetings, accommodations, et.

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE BEFORE YOU LEAVE THE WORKSHOP, OR MAIL IT TO:

Corrine Garland
731 Wax Myrtle Lane
Houston, Texas 77079

About the HCEEP Rural Network

The Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP) Rural Network is an association of professionals representing education programs for young handicapped children in rural communities. Members are drawn primarily from projects supported by the HCEEP, Office of Special Education, Department of Education. Formed in 1978, the Rural Network undertook to provide a voice for rural America's young children and their families. The network aimed to increase educational opportunities for this population through the accomplishment of a variety of activities. Participating projects also intended to enhance their own effectiveness in providing education and supportive services in rural areas. For further information, contact:

Harris Gabel
P.O. Box 151
Peabody College of Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

or

Patricia Hutinger
Outreach: Macomb 0-3 Regional Project
27 Horrabin Hall
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois 61455

or

David Shearer
Exceptional Child Center
UMC 68
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84322

or

Corinne Garland
14942 Bramblewood
Houston, Texas 77079

Additional copies of this monograph may be secured by sending $5.00 to cover cost of production and mailing to:

Rural Network
College of Education
Room 27, Horrabin Hall
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois 61455

Prices subject to change without notice.

Topics for the two series of Rural Network Monographs include:

-An Overview of Initial Survey Results
-Influencing Decision Makers
-Cost Analysis
-Parent Involvement
-Transportation
-Interagency Coordination
-Recruiting and Retaining Staff
-Securing Funds
-Service Delivery Models
-Health Care/Education Collaboration
-Community Awareness Strategies